THE DOCTRINE OF

THE INCARNATION

OF

OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/doctrineofincarn0000arch

THE DOCTRINE OF

THE INCARNATION

OF

OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST,

IN ITS

Relation to Mankind and to the Church.

BY THE LATE

ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE, A.M.

"Ad imaginem Dei factus est homo, illa imagine qua postea homo factus est Deus."—S. AUGUSTINUS.

"Corpus regenerati fit caro crucifixi."—S. LEO.

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

London:
A. D. INNES & CO.,
(LATE WALTER SMITH & INNES),
31 & 32, BEDFORD STREET, STRAND, W.C.

1892.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE YEARNINGS OF HUMANITY AFTER A DIVINE DELIVERER.

The Gospel opens with a *Personal* Deliverer. Previous anticipations of a Divine Helper. The Divine Power associated by Greeks with Beauty of Form: by Orientals with Immensity. The Incarnation the setting forth of an external Saviour.

The subject divided into two main parts—First, the Doctrine of the Incarnation in itself; Secondly, the Benefits which mankind receive by it. The necessity of believing in the existence of a Saviour as an actual object, external to our minds . . . . . *Pages* 1—6

CHAPTER I.

CHRIST THE PATTERN MAN; THE FIRST FRUITS AND BEGINNING OF THE NEW CREATION.

The inquiry begins with Christ's Human Nature. Christ the Pattern Man. The principles of humanity find their perfection in Him. Illustration—from the feelings of loyalty, and the endowments of genius.

Christ the Pattern of Humanity, not only through the development of its natural powers, but also through the introduction into it of what is supernatural. The first, the fundamental principle of Rationalism; the second of the Church—the first built on Pantheism, the second on the Incarnation. Christ the perfection of Manhood by Office, Nature, and Sympathy . . . . . *Pages* 6—11

CHAPTER II.

THE OFFICE OF CHRIST AS THE PATTERN MAN MARKED OUT IN ANCIENT SCRIPTURE.

Scripture testified from the first that the restoration of man's race would be effected through some principle working within it.

Indefinite expectations of the Patriarchal age. This inward principle identified with that external gift, which was to be bestowed through the seed of Abraham. *Personal* character of the heir of David's throne. The Prophets reveal more fully the coming exaltation of man's nature through its single representative and head, the *Son of Man* . . . . . *Pages* 11—21

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

CHAPTER III.

CHRIST THE PATTERN MAN BY NATURE.

Christ the *Son of Man*, as no other could be, through the *constitution* of His *nature*. This built on two considerations—First, The nature of that Humanity which was taken by Christ: Secondly, His manner of taking it.

I. Nature shows itself by continuity of type in animals and in men. Its assertion not open to the charge of Realism. It depends upon the law of organization, by which every race of animated beings is bound together.

Limits of Traducianism and Creatianism. The whole race of man one, through the community of nature. Testimony to its unity in Scripture. This common nature taken by Christ. His consequent relation to all mankind.

II. When Christ took our nature He became its *representative*, because He was the second Adam. Adam the type of man's race—First, because the father of all; Secondly, because the model on which all are formed. The same two things found in Christ.

How Adam was the type on which humanity was formed. Purity of those principles of body, soul, and spirit which have been perverted in his descendants. A divine light needed for their guidance. This light connected with that image of God which supplied the whole perfection of humanity. Three especial effects of God's image. The principle of conscience a remnant of it. This gift of a divine light perfectly given back to humanity in Christ.

Christ consubstantial with our nature, but without sin:—inference respecting man's sinfulness. Christ the new Adam, because all which was designed for humanity in the First Man is attained in the Second. Man's nature *recapitulated* in Christ. The expectation of man surpassed.

The evil of idolatry, whether material or mental, is that God's image is lost sight of . . . . . *Pages* 22—58

CHAPTER IV.

CHRIST THE PATTERN MAN IN SYMPATHY.

Our Lord had a real human character—such as suited the Pattern Man—both in body and mind.

His Body shown to sympathize with ours by the circumstances of His Life. That His Body was that of the Pattern Man, shown in four things—freedom from sickness—power over animals—freedom from death—His being the source of life to others.

The reality of His human mind shown in respect of the will and of the understanding.—His will assailed like ours. But the only will since Adam's which ever possessed perfect freedom.—Our Lord's manhood not positively ignorant, but ignorant *as man*, or so far as concerns

those means of knowledge which men employ. The true source of perfect knowledge—intercourse with God—was first restored to men in Him.

The perfection of Christ's sympathy and the universality of His human mind, the consequences of His being truly a man, and yet the Pattern Man . . . . . *Pages* 58—78

CHAPTER V.

OUR LORD IS GOD THE WORD, VERY GOD OF VERY GOD.

Wonderful nature of this truth. The only explanation, however, of other mysteries.

Our Lord's Deity the key to all the Creeds. To trace the manner in which they arose out of it, the best method of appreciating it. Its full relations communicated to the Apostles by immediate Inspiration —to their successors, by the teaching of the Spirit. The Early Church not only a witness to facts, but possessed of authority, because guided by the Holy Ghost. The Creeds stand on the united force of historical testimony and divine teaching. Need of the perpetual counterpoise of written Scripture. Advantage of profiting by the religious growth of the Church's mind. The Church's whole system of doctrine elicited by its defence of the truth, that Christ was the God-man. His *Manhood* especially assailed in the Second Century. His *Godhead* in the Third and Fourth. In the Fifth the Personal *Unity* of His two natures.

Century Second. Ebionites deny Our Lord's Godhead, Gnostics His Manhood. Justin Martyr maintains Our Lord's Godhead—from prophecy —from the doctrine of the Logos, as the wisdom of God. Christ's pre-existence—His independence of the Creation.

Deeper arguments of St. Irenæus, in his defence of Our Lord's Manhood. The Logos, the representative of the *moral* attributes of God, as opposed to the Gnostic notion, that God's essence consisted in mere Infinity. Our Lord really a man, because the New Head of man's race. Proofs of His true humanity—First, from His atoning death; Secondly, from His real union with men in the Holy Communion. The elements employed in this feast bread and wine; its object to unite men to the manhood of Christ.

Century Third. Objections brought against Our Lord's Godhead, from its alleged inconsistency with the Divine Unity. The arguments which had been adduced for Our Lord's Divinity, from the relation of the Logos to the Divine Attributes—and from His mission to create the world—are found, if taken by themselves, to be insufficient. The first, by allowing the Word to be supposed a mere character of Godhead, would leave an opening for Sabellianism—the second, by exhibiting Him as an inferior minister, would leave an opening for Arianism.

Anticipation of the right answer in St. Irenæus. The Son personally distinguished from the Father, in Himself, and independently of the world. The Son of *one substance* with the Father [Tertullian]. Bound to the Father by *eternal generation* [Origen].

The Antenicene writers were not in error respecting Our Lord's nature. Three Local Councils held in the Third Century—two which opposed opinions having a Sabellian, one those which had an Arian tendency.

Century Fourth. Arian and Sabellian Heresies condemned in General Councils of Nice and Constantinople. Teaching of St. Athanasius.

The Doctrine of the Trinity, the assertion of some real mystery in the nature of God. Not a contradiction in terms, though beyond our comprehension. One God, yet truly Three Persons. To explain away the Doctrine of the Three Divine Persons the more prevalent danger at present. This error was guarded against in early times, because the Church started from the worship of *Incarnate* God, and the existence of separate Personalities in the Godhead is a necessary pre-requisite to the Incarnation. But unless the discriminating condition of such Personalities is laid in the nature of Godhead itself, their reality will evaporate either in Arianism or Sabellianism.

The Incarnation, therefore, involves the *Eternal Sonship* of the Word. That the *Second* Person in the Blessed Trinity should have undertaken to become Incarnate, the result of His original nature. The Son the *natural* representative of the Father's moral attributes, and His *natural* object of contemplation. Hence the doctrine of the Divine *Coinherence*. Its relation to the Christian notion of the moral nature of God.

Thus the single truth of the Divine Incarnation leads up to the conclusion that the Ever-Blessed Trinity does not exist for the sake of the world, but in and for itself, and therefore is the ultimate cause and object of all existence . . . . . *Pages* 78—123

CHAPTER VI.

THE UNITY OF PERSONS BETWEEN GOD THE WORD AND THE SON OF MAN.

The Personal *Oneness* of Godhead and Manhood in Christ, not less essential to His Office than the reality of each nature. The reality of Christ's two natures assailed in the fifth century: His Godhead by the Nestorians—His Manhood by the Eutychians. Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

Error of Nestorius to deny that the Son of Mary was truly God. By denying the distinction between nature and personality, he excluded the possibility of a union between God and man. This union practically testified by the Holy Communion.

The Hypostatical union the real presence in one person of two distinct natures, Godhead and Manhood. The Personality of Christ lies in the former. But an intimate connexion obtains between His two natures. From which connexion comes the *ennobling* of *humanity*. Effect which one nature produced upon the other.

The exaltation which Christ bestowed upon man's nature, as God, by His Incarnation, distinct from that which, as man, He procured for it by His Obedience. The exaltation of Manhood in the Incarnation

limited only by the conditions of the Created nature. To omit this limitation, as done by Eutyches, entails the very same result which was arrived at by Nestorius—the denial of a true union between God and man. For He could not be the representative of man, if Manhood was swallowed up in Godhead.

The Descent of Our Lord's human soul into Hell, sets forth the permanence of His humanity. Opinion of Monothelites really involves the evils of the system of Eutyches. Remarkable durability of these heresies. Honour conferred on humanity by the Incarnation . *Pages* 123—143

CHAPTER VII.

OUR LORD'S MEDIATION THE CONSEQUENCE OF HIS INCARNATION.

Our Lord's Mediation is not a work which is arbitrarily undertaken, but results from His being the *real medium* through whom Godhead has been *pleased* to communicate with Manhood. Our Lord's *nature* made the basis of the Creeds, because His *offices* are dependent upon it. By virtue of His mediation He is the sole channel of intercourse between God and Man. And must so continue during His mediatorial kingdom . . . . . *Pages* 144—149

CHAPTER VIII.

OUR LORD'S ACTS OF MEDIATION PREVIOUSLY TO HIS ASCENSION; OR HIS TEACHING, HIS EXAMPLE, AND HIS SACRIFICE.

Our Lord's Mediation may be viewed in reference either to God or to man. Our Lord's teaching and example renders men conscious of truths which their own hearts witness.

The characteristic of Our Lord's acts towards God was Obedience. The crowning act of obedience, His Death. This the true ransom for man, of which all sacrifices were typical. Burnt-offerings, Sin-offerings, and Peace-offerings, have their completion in Him. His work of redemption a *real* work, making a difference in the relations between God and Man.

Both the Divine and Human Nature in Christ contribute to the work of redemption. The Divine nature renders Our Lord a fitting Priest, and a sufficient victim.—His Human nature gives mankind a participation in His work.

Without venturing to pronounce *à priori* on the necessity of Our Lord's sacrifice, we find in it a revealed example of God's justice. The justice of Our Lord's answering for men, as being the Head of man's race, with whom the whole race is actually connected. St. Anselm's reason why fallen spirits not salvable . . . . . *Pages* 149—166

CHAPTER IX.

OF OUR LORD'S ACTS OF MEDIATION, SUBSEQUENTLY TO HIS ASCENSION, AND FIRST OF HIS INTERCESSION.

Christ our perpetual Advocate in Heaven. How His Godhead and His Manhood conjoin in this service. Difficulty of realizing it as a *present* work. Yet such belief results from accepting Christ's Incarnation as a *reality*. Infidelity on this subject, owing in part to a covert Socinianism or Sabellianism.

Christ's Intercession in heaven, exhibited figuratively in the Book of Revelation—argumentatively in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The consequent oneness of that service which is offered by the whole Church on earth. To pray for the sake of Christ is to trust to that Intercession which He makes as the God-man . . *Pages* 165—179

CHAPTER X.

OUR LORD'S SPIRITUAL PRESENCE AS MEDIATOR WITH MEN.

All Christ's acts towards man since His Ascension are summed up in His Presence as the God-man: *i.e.* in such presence as implies the action of His human as well as of His Divine nature.

I. Christ's Presence with His people implies the Presence of His *Humanity*, because that which departed at His Ascension was thus given back; and because it is a presence in some places, and under certain conditions, whereas Godhead, taken by itself, is everywhere present.

Objections drawn, first, from the coming of the Holy Ghost; secondly, from God's peculiar presence under the ancient Covenant.

Answer to the first objection postponed; answer to the second—that all those media of intercourse, which God was previously pleased to adopt, are superseded by the real Mediation of the God-man. The efficacy of prayer depends upon His Presence as man, because upon His Mediation.

II. Christ's Presence as man not carnal, or material, but spiritual. Material substances are present in place and by contact. Spiritual substances not subject to these laws. Our Lord's material body in heaven. Its presence upon earth through spiritual power.

Spiritual not less *real* than material presence. Spiritual not the same thing as figurative. Our Lord's spiritual presence does not depend upon the conceptions of men, but implies a real power, resulting from the influence of His Godhead.

III. The Presence of Christ shown to be the Presence of His Manhood, because the office of the Holy Ghost is to unite men to it. The *coming* of the Holy Ghost is the undertaking this office. Therefore, the Holy Ghost said to be sent by the Incarnate Son.

By this means does the co-operation of the Holy Ghost in the Mediatorial office of the Son consist with their Personal distinctness.

IV. The benefits of that union with Christ's manhood, which it is the office of the Holy Ghost to effect, must be *real*, and not technical or artificial.

Man's salvation dependent on those graces, which had their *fountain* and *well-head* in the Head and Pattern of our race, the Man Christ Jesus. The manner in which they are transmitted from Him to others inscrutable, but parallel to the transmission of natural powers. The last Adam a quickening spirit. His *Manhood* the vine in which we are branches.

Adam the perfection of nature; Christ, according to His Manhood, the perfection of grace, in whom Manhood was perfected and purified. This renders Him the *continual* Mediator between God and Man, through whom the gifts bestowed by the one flow into the other.

The denial of this function of Christ's Manhood is intimately connected either with the Arian or the Sabellian heresy. Evils of either alternative . . . . . *Pages* 179—211

CHAPTER XI.

CHRIST IS PRESENT WITH MEN IN HIS CHURCH OR BODY MYSTICAL.

Objective nature of this inquiry. Intimate union between Christ and His Church. As shown by Scriptural expressions respecting His Body. A real relation between His Body Natural and His Body Mystical. The Church's Unity the result of this relation.

The assertion of the Church's Unity in Scripture and the Creed, shows it not to be an accidental circumstance, but a fundamental principle—the result of *organization*, not of enactment. Its rule and origin is the harmony of Persons in the Blessed Trinity. The unity which exists above is extended to mankind in Church-union, through the Mediation of Christ.

This system no abridgment of man's liberty, because it does not preclude the actings of God on individual minds. But those who understand the nature of Christ's Mediation as the God-man cannot safely overlook it.

Result of addressing God as the Ultimate Spirit of the Universe, independently of Sacramental system, as done by the Quakers. Since the channel of Mediation is opened to us through the Manhood of Christ, to leave His *Manhood* out of account in our approach to God, even though we used His name, would be to pass over His Mediation. Evil of allowing internal emotions, or anything by which we draw near to Christ, to supersede those external ordinances by which Christ draws near to us. Testimony of Hooker and Jackson.

The history of Fox, the founder of the Quakers, shows the manner in which the notion of an immediate intercourse with God, through the self-originating action of the mind, leads to a forgetfulness of that Mediation of Christ which He discharges as the God-man. Coincidence between his principle and the Sabellian theory, which destroys the permanence of the union between the Son of God and the Son of Man.

Other examples of the connexion between the full recognition of Our Lord's nature and the doctrines of grace. Schleiermacher denies the existence of any real relation between the Mystical Body of Christ and His Body Natural. His opinion traced to his denial of that diversity

of Persons in the Trinity, which is a necessary pre-requisite to a permanent union between Godhead and Manhood in Christ. Archbishop Whately's tendency to represent the Church as a technical system of restrictions, rather than as the effect of Christ's Presence by Grace.

To recognise Christ's Mediation through His Man's nature, as the *Fountain of Grace*, is the right security against the error of putting the Church in the place of Christ: it supplies the principle of Church-Communion and of Church-Obedience . . . . . *Pages* 211—230

CHAPTER XII.

OF COMMON WORSHIP AS A MEANS OF UNION WITH THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST.

I. Common Worship the natural voice and action of the Christian Community.

II. Its intimate connexion with the very essence of Christianity, shown by its maintenance in early times, even when forbidden by law, and not directly commanded in Scripture.

III. The advantage possessed by Israelites was that opportunity of *access* to God which was maintained by their Public Ritual. In which even those who were unavoidably absent from the Temple had an interest.

IV. The like advantage secured for Christians through that Communion in Church Offices whereby they participate in the *Mediation* of Christ. This privilege men cannot enjoy except as members together in the Body of Christ. Christ's Intercession is especially on behalf of His Body Mystical.

Since Christ's Intercession is a *perpetual* work, the mean whereby it is perpetually participated is essential. But the Sacrifice of the Holy Communion, which is the act whereby it is especially participated, is a federal act, and therefore implies participation in Common Worship.

In what Sense the Holy Communion is truly the Christian Sacrifice. This character belongs to it in consequence of its connexion with the offering of Christ's Body upon the Cross once for all. This Body present materially in heaven. Christ's sacrificial acts above are participated in by Christians through the sacrificial acts of His ministers.

Objection 1st—That this is not to ascribe sufficient reality to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. But it is to make it as truly a sacrifice as the Passover. The reality of its sacrificial character depends upon the *reality* of those functions which Christ continues to discharge as the God-man.

Objection 2nd—That too much reality is hereby ascribed to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. For it is alleged that the existence of a Sacerdotal system in the Church is—First, inconsistent with the privileges of Christians—and Secondly, incompatible with the prerogative of Christ.

But First, the privileges of Christians arise from that union with the Manhood of Christ which is maintained by the Sacerdotal system—Secondly, to suppose that a Sacerdotal system is incompatible with the prerogative of Christ, would be to assign too little to Christ, and

too much to men. For it would be to suppose that Christ's Mediation is not real, which it is—and that men's Mediation was real, which it was not. The Jewish sacrifices and priesthood depended for their whole efficacy on Christ—and the reality of the Christian Sacrifice arises from the perpetuity of Christ's Intercession for that Mystical Body, to which men are associated in Common Worship.

V. Scripture witnesses to the *existence* of a Christian Ministry, by the agency whereof men are joined to the humanity of Christ. The *nature* of this Ministry gathered from the practice of the Apostles. Apostolical Succession the safest course.

Abandonment of the Apostolic Succession has usually been followed by a disbelief in the reality of those means whereby union with Christ as the God-man is maintained. The absence of a public Liturgy has contributed to the same result. Consequent loss of the real dignity of Christian privileges, as dependent on Communion with Christ, the Incarnate Head . . . . . *Pages* 239—274

CHAPTER XIII.

OF SACRAMENTS AS MEANS OF UNION WITH THE MANHOOD OF CHRIST.

Sacraments "*The Extension of the Incarnation.*" Their object is—First, to be "badges or tokens of Christian men's profession;" Secondly, to be channels of Grace. They have the advantage of being a comfort in doubt, without ministering to pride.

The prejudice against Sacraments as an arbitrary appointment vanishes, if we remember that their essence is to be the means by which the members of Christ are united to their Head. While other means of grace *result from* union with Christ, they *effect* it. For such a work their compound nature gives them a singular congruity. Man's whole being requires to be united to Christ.

Graces flow into humanity, because first concentrated in the Person of Christ. A just appreciation of what was present in Him, connected with a true belief of what is communicated to us. The mode of communication spiritual and not material.

The benefit of Sacraments does not result from the inherent efficacy of the elements themselves, either in Baptism or the Lord's Supper—for, First, the elements would not gain more *Sacramental* virtue through any material transmutation; and, Secondly, such an opinion would withdraw men from that reference to the Person of Christ which is the essence of the Sacrament. Testimony of St. Jerome and St. Augustin. We do not understand the natural, much less the supernatural effect of the elements.

The benefit of Sacraments results from the spiritual influence of Christ, with whom they bring us into connexion. Two senses in which the word *spiritual* is used—one subjective and metaphorical, the other objective and real. The latter sense is intended in this case, because Christ, with whom we are brought into connexion by immaterial influence, is an actual Being external to us.

Baptism stated in Scripture to effect our first union with Christ. Objections drawn—first, from Calvinistic Doctrine of Decrees; secondly, from the want of visible results. But,

First, the statement of Scripture that Baptism is the means of original union with Christ, is not more inconsistent with Calvinistic decrees, than its general invitations to repentance.

Secondly, the common want of effect may arise from want of faith, and is not more than was exhibited in Adam.

The statements of the Liturgy respecting Baptism are not merely hypothetical—because an assertion, not a hope; and because they speak of its present effect, not its future consequences. Their rejection involves the Pelagian hypothesis, that the first movement towards man's salvation comes from themselves. Christian education proceeds on the supposition that grace has already been given.

The Lord's Supper a real participation of Christ. The sixth chapter of St. John has a prophetic relation to it. It was not ministered until the Holy Ghost had been pleased to become the means of union between Christ's manhood and His mystical members.

To deny the *reality* of Sacraments is to supersede the action of Christ as Mediator between God and man . . . . . *Pages* 275—311

CHAPTER XIV.

CHRIST AS MEDIATOR THE SOURCE OF HOLINESS AND KNOWLEDGE TO MANKIND.

General effects of the system of Mediation upon the position of mankind. The gifts of holiness and knowledge bestowed through this channel.

First—Civil institutions have been supposed capable of bestowing them. The principles of Rationalism suppose man united to God through the gifts bestowed on him at Creation, and by the mere exercise of thought. Failure of the attempt, for want of some power which may recover what in Adam was lost.

Secondly—Religious institutions looked to with the same view. But these, so far as they are true, refer to Him who by His nature is the only real Mediator. All gifts, therefore, of Holiness and Truth come through Him.

I. Holiness has its source in God. Bestowed through the Mediator on man. So far as it is perfect, it is *imparted*; but the *infused* holiness, which is necessary to salvation, has likewise its life from the fountain from which it is derived.

II. Truth has its source in God. Like Holiness, it is bestowed upon fallen man through the Mediator, and is both *imparted*, and *infused*, or *engrafted*.

The *imparted* truth depends on that Personal Word, who has become Incarnate to instruct men. His Gospel the *final* system of truth. The Holy Scriptures its written expression. St. Optatus's testimony.

The *engrafted* truth is that power of spiritual discernment which the Incarnate Word communicates to His mystical Body. That the external

record of imparted truth, *i.e.*, Holy Scripture, cannot be understood without that engrafted truth or internal principle of spiritual illumination, which God the Son bestows upon His Mystic Body, is shown — First, by the common use of the term "Word" in both cases; Secondly, by consideration of the revealed office of the Mediatorial Word, whose record Holy Scripture is, in guiding the Body of Christ into all truth by His Spirit. So that the Word engrafted, which dwells in the Body Mystical, is essential to the understanding of that Word imparted, which is communicated through the Scriptures.

Objection 1st—That since the Word conveys its *imparted* gifts through written documents, to assert the *engrafted* Word to be necessary to its understanding, interferes with the prerogative of reason. But,

First—To admit reason to be, *in itself*, exclusively of God's engrafted wisdom, a competent judge of all truth, is inconsistent with belief in any objective system of revelation. That *some* reference must be made to the principle of reason is the necessary result of human responsibility. [*Duty* of Private Judgment.] But the reasoning faculty, which claims to be independent of God's engrafted wisdom, must be such a principle as refuses to acknowledge any authority except its own. [*Right* of Private Judgment.] It rests its conclusions, therefore, either on the senses of which it makes use [Sensualism of Locke]; or on the senses, together with the inward constitution of the mind. [Intellectualism of Kant.] In either case it cannot rise to that which is higher than itself, *i.e.*, to God's revelation.

Secondly—The limits under which reason may be safely exercised are found by considering that Divine things cannot enter the mind except through some faculty which supplies means of communing with *external truth*. Such a faculty is *Faith*. Faith is an original source of knowledge, and co-ordinate with reason—it limits the authority of reason while it increases its sphere of knowledge.

Faith depends on the laws of that common nature of man which testifies to its authority. How this nature was ascertained by Heathen Moralists. *Natural* types of excellence exhibited only what man possessed by Creation, which ends in Rationalism. Christian faith rests on the higher estate to which nature is elevated, because participated by that *Divine* type of humanity, the second Adam. Christian Faith therefore depends on the laws of that renewed nature, which, through Mediation, has been bestowed upon the Mystical Body of Christ. From union with this Mystical Body of the Church, are derived those fundamental principles, which form the basis of Christian reasoning respecting questions of religion.

To assert, therefore, that the *Word engrafted* is needful to the comprehension of the *Word imparted*, or that truth is attained through the teaching of that Spirit which dwells in the Body of Christ, is not to interfere with the due province of reason, but to enable reason to attain its full perfection by the aid of Christian faith.

Respect for the *engrafted* Word has always been found to keep pace with reverence for the Word *imparted*. The Inspiration of Scripture and the Church's Authority have stood or fallen together. Common theories of *Inspiration* unsatisfactory. Those who would draw their

system of truth by mere logical deduction from the text of Scripture, require to discover one which is more satisfactory. None has been put forward by the Church, because her system of interpretation is not built on man's logic, though not contrary to it, but on the gift of the engrafted Word.

Objection 2nd—That to suppose the *engrafted* Word, dwelling in the Church, to be essential to the understanding of the Scripture or Word *imparted*, is inconsistent with the claims of individual illumination.

Preliminary admission that the excepted cases, in which God bestows an especial gift of guidance, will be numerous. But this does not preclude the existence of a rule. General effect produced by the Church's testimony in maintaining the standard of opinion. For,

First—To allow private illumination to be a sufficient judge of the Word imparted, without reference to that Word engrafted which dwells in the body of the Church, is incompatible with the authority of Scripture—Proof of this in the case of Semler and of Fox—for it depends on the notion of an immediate intercourse between God and man, which may dispense as well with the Word imparted as with the Word engrafted.

Secondly—The due regard to private illumination is its subordination to the system of Mediation, which supposes that gifts are bestowed through the dwelling of the Word engrafted in the Body of Christ.

To admit Church authority, therefore, is to allow that truth is not derived from man's *natural* intercourse with his Maker, but through the channel of the one *Mediator*. Its security His promise of perpetual presence with His Body Mystical. The applicability of the rule impaired but not destroyed by the Church's divisions. *Unity* as essential to the Church's perfection as *holiness* . . *Pages* 312—363

CHAPTER XV.

CONCLUSION.

That the Doctrine of Our Lord's *Humanity* is not duly appreciated, appears,

First—From the practical forgetfulness of the doctrine of future judgment, which will be exercised by Christ with the *reality* which is suggested to us by His Man's nature.

Secondly—From the neglect of those seasons of the Christian year by which the acts of Christ as *Mediator* are commemorated; as those of the Creator were by the Jewish Festivals. The Lord's Day a Christian and not a Jewish Sabbath.

Thirdly—From the infrequency of Sacraments and Public Worship.

Need of some principle of union amidst the increasing turmoil of the age . . . . . *Pages* 363—370

THE DOCTRINE

OF THE

INCARNATION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

INTRODUCTION.

THE YEARNINGS OF HUMANITY AFTER A DIVINE DELIVERER.

"*The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David.*" Thus does the later volume of Revelation usher in the advent of Him on whom its mysteries and blessings are dependent. The Gospel, like the Church's year, begins with the coming of the Son of God in the flesh. And so is it with the first-placed of the Epistles. It begins by declaring that the Gospel of God concerns "His Son Jesus Christ Our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power." Thus personal is the dispensation of the Gospel. It rests not, like the theories of Rationalistic philosophy, on the self-relying development of man's inherent powers, but on the advent of an external Saviour. And herein it fulfilled the darling anticipations of man's heart, which for four thousand years had been yearning after the expected birth of some deliverer—of some one who might redress the miseries which afflicted every station, age, and country, and give reality

to that golden dream, which lived in the consecrated traditions of the past, and the inspired imaginations of the future.

Now this service, as men's natural conscience testified, could be effected only by some one who was above themselves: for what was witnessed by the traditions of primitive antiquity had been confirmed by the experience of forty centuries. And hence arose the two great systems of religion, by which the East and West were distinguished from each other. The intellectual yet sensitive Greek, surrounded by all the forms of natural beauty, exalted the deified inhabitants of his Olympus into the courts of heaven, and looked to the advocacy of these favoured representatives of humanity.

> Ille deûm vitam accipiet, divisque videbit
> Permixtas heroas, et ipse videbitur illis.

Hence the Anthropomorphism of the western world. If men had become gods, there was hope that the inferior might, in some way, be benefited by the superior nature. And the same feeling, though acting in an opposite direction, possessed the more thoughtful sages of Asia. For the original character of our race, which could not be altogether effaced from men's minds, was moulded according to the situation and habits of nations. In the boundless plains of the East, where man seemed nothing in the face of the immensity of nature, there was still the same longing for the patronage of some higher being, which, by condescending to the weakness of our race, might work its welfare. Such help men hoped to find in those mighty principles which lay hid in the powers of organized nature. Hence the Avatars of Vishnoo, and the worship of every varied form, under which were personified the principles of the physical creation. The same thing may be seen in the purer worship of ancient Persia. "The kingdoms of Ormusd and Ahriman are in continual contest with one another; but Ahriman will hereafter be conquered; the reign of darkness will be altogether at an end; the rule of Ormusd will be universally extended; and an all-embracing

kingdom of light will alone remain."[1] All these conceptions imply the conviction that man's evils could not be redressed, unless some power from above should stoop to meet him, and they testify to the same need which was felt by the less abstracted Greek, for union with the Most High.

This deep-rooted feeling, which had maintained its place in the two grand branches of the family of Japheth, as their borders had been enlarged through the East and West, was to be satisfied only when they took up their dwelling in the tents of Shem, and paid fealty to the God of Abraham. Hitherto "the earnest expectation of the creature" had been waiting "for the manifestation of the sons of God." But "when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."[2] Through this gift was that end attained, after which humanity had been yearning. In Him at once it came to pass, that "truth shall flourish out of the earth, and righteousness hath looked down from heaven." For thus did a higher Being enter into relations with mankind, and set Himself forth as their deliverer.

Thus does Our Lord's coming in the flesh lie at the very beginning of the Gospel. It is stated in the first pages of Revelation—it answers to the first wants of men. To this truth, then, it is proposed to draw attention in the following pages. *The Incarnation will be set forth as the great objective fact of Christianity.* It will be shown in what manner Our Lord's *Mediation* is built upon His *participation in man's nature.* For as such participation was essential to that one Sacrifice upon the Cross, on which rests the efficacy, not only of His Church's perpetual services, but of His own Intercession at the heavenly altar, so also has His human nature become the channel through which all gifts of grace are bestowed upon men. The subject divides itself naturally into two parts—first, the Doctrine of the Incarnation itself; and secondly, the benefits which mankind

[1] Zendavesta, quoted in Heeren's Ideen, i. 446.
[2] Gal. iv. 4.

receive by it. Such an inquiry, unless the writer is mistaken, will suit the wants of the present day. Religion being a divine reality, implies the truth of certain outward facts, external to ourselves, which have an existence independent of our thoughts, and are the objects of our consideration. Neither can it flourish, unless the subjective action of our thoughts be maintained by the presence of such objective realities. For example, we are justified by faith in Christ. Now, as faith is a process in our own minds, to discriminate between a true or living faith, and a dead or feigned one, is to inquire into the *subjective* part of the doctrine of justification—into the part, that is, which belongs to us, who are the *subject* matter of its operation. But, then, our faith must have an object to rest upon—the oblation of Christ upon the cross once for all; and unless this event had truly happened, unless this great deed, external to ourselves, had an actual place in the world of realities, our inward feelings would be only a delusive dream.[1]

When the minds of men are roused from any protracted apathy, their first inquiries will, of course, be of a subjective character, because they will begin by taking a survey of their own state, before they pass into the world around. And this accounts for the subjective tone which marked the great reaction of the sixteenth century, as well as for the predominance of the same temper in the last generation. In the last age, the first object required was to provoke men to a seriousness which was too often wanting, and thus to call them to an examination of their own hearts. But it is time that the *subjective* revival of the

[1] "Faith receives the seeds of grace from the Spirit, and thus brings forth the germ of a Christian life, rich in the fruit of good works; but the notion that faith itself, as a mere human faculty, is the creative principle of all good, is so fascinating, from its tendency to magnify man's heart and mind, that we need to keep watch against every approach to it."

And again: "Such errors have often prevailed, and have prepared the way, ultimately, for the denial of all substantial reality in the objects of faith, converting religion, according to one theory, into a product of human feeling—according to another, into a product of human reason."—*Hare's Mss. of the Comforter*, vol. ii. p. 453, Note H.

last age should assume also an *objective* character. If this be neglected, it will gradually die out, like so many other religious revivals; and the real earnestness which dictated its growth will evaporate in a system of empty phrases and party watchwords. And the sure consequence, if men fancy themselves deluded by a phraseology, which has no counterpart in the external world, will be the growth of open or covert infidelity. Such has been the result arrived at by a popular writer, who tells us, "that all genuine faith is—other circumstances being the same—of about equal value. *The value is in the act of faith more than in the object.*" And though admitting that "it is of very high importance that the objects of faith should be the loftiest and the purest that in any particular age can be attained," the authoress cited appears to consider all religions upon a par as regards their abstract truth, and observes that "men afflict themselves needlessly about one another's safety, as regards points of spiritual belief."[1] This were doubtless true, if man's life resembled a mere soliloquy, in which the purpose was to give vent only to the feelings of his own mind. But if we be truly surrounded by a world of unseen beings, if we have actually "come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God, the JUDGE OF ALL, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the MEDIATOR of the new covenant," then, surely, it cannot be immaterial whether we rightly apprehend those mighty realities which press upon us so nearly, and whether our acts and language are fitted for that hallowed intercourse to which we have been admitted. Otherwise, we are intruding, like unconscious dreamers, into the sacred presence of the Great King. Hence the desire of the present writer, as being bound by education and hereditary attachment to those *evangelical* principles in which he was nurtured, to call attention

[1] *Eastern Life*, by Harriet Martineau, vol. iii. pp. 289 91.

to the external truths, on which the *doctrines of grace* are dependent. For it is no system of idle words which is made known by the holy Apostles, "concerning Jesus Christ Our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power."

CHAPTER I.

CHRIST, THE PATTERN MAN, THE FIRST FRUITS AND BEGINNING OF THE NEW CREATION.

An inquiry respecting Our Lord's nature might be conducted in two ways: either we might consider what He was at first, and what He subsequently became: or we might view Him as He was manifest upon earth, and then pass from the apparent to the hidden characteristics of His being. In the first case, we should begin with His Godhead; in the second, with His manhood. And the latter is, perhaps, the most natural course, because His Incarnation is a central point, from which we may approach the eternity which preceded, as well as that which follows it. In numbers, unity is a starting-point for those infinite series which ascend above or descend below it; and Our Lord's taking flesh of the Virgin Mary, His mother, is the only thing on which our minds can fix, which at all resembles a beginning of His being. For time is that middle space, from which finite spirits must track their way, either forwards or backwards, into the profundities of eternity. We begin, then, with the Apostle, that Jesus Christ Our Lord was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh."

And in this statement, what is especially material is, that Our Lord came to be THE man, not A man—to be David's offspring, the woman's seed, the representative of the human family, the chief among His brethren, the heir of whatever great qualities

belonged to mortal flesh, the antagonist of Satan, the second Adam, the new head of man's race. The disposition to look for such a type or pattern, in which may be perfectly expressed what each man's consciousness imperfectly witnesses, lies deep in human nature. It expresses itself in letters as well as in institutions—in admiration for the poet, and in loyalty to the king. For what is the natural root of loyalty, as distinguished from such mere selfish desire of personal security, as is apt to take its place in civilized times, but that consciousness of a natural bond among the families of men, which gives a fellow-feeling to whole clans and nations, and thus enlists their affections in behalf of those time-honoured representatives of their ancient blood, in whose success they feel a personal interest? Hence the delight when we recognize an act of nobility or justice in our hereditary princes.

> Tuque prior, tu parce genus qui ducis Olympo,
> Projice tela manu *sanguis meus*.

So strong is this feeling, that it regains an engrafted influence, even when history witnesses that past convulsions have rent and weakened it; and the Celtic feeling towards the Stuarts has been rekindled in our own days towards the granddaughter of George the Third of Hanover.

Somewhat similar may be seen in the disposition to idolize those great lawgivers of man's race, who have given expression, in the immortal language of song, to the deeper inspirations of our nature. The thoughts of Homer or of Shakespeare are the universal inheritance of the human race. In this mutual ground every man meets his brother: they have been set forth by the Providence of God to vindicate for all of us what nature could effect, and that, in these representatives of our race, we might recognize our common benefactors.

These are among the natural indications of that hereditary bond of brotherhood, which attained its perfect consummation in that supernatural advent of the *Son of Man*, of whom all

earthly excellence is typical. For it is a characteristic of the Gospel to give a higher employment to every faculty of the understanding, and a nobler object to every affection of the heart. Its basis is that personal union between God and man, which has added a diviner character to all the relations of humanity. Manhood, with all its mysterious secrets of thought and feeling, has been chosen to be the temple of God. And this has been brought about, not by the natural exaltation of the inferior race, but by the entrance of that higher seed, from whose intercommunion it has received a supernatural elevation. For there are two ways in which Christ might be set forth as that Pattern Man, in whom our nature attained its perfection. Either He might be the happy example in whom its native qualities found their perfect expression, in whom all that belongs to mere humanity obtained the utmost development of which it was susceptible; or the perfection of His manhood might be due to the influence of that Divine nature, with which it was personally united. The first of these is the system of Rationalism—the second, the system of the Church. And it is the main purpose of the present inquiry to show that the latter system is not only sanctioned by the authority of revelation, and adapted to the wants of man, but that whatever truth or reason the system of Rationalism may promise, it could be attained only through that perfect exhibition of man's nature, of which its supernatural adoption by its divine participator was the cause. The system of Rationalism, indeed, can go along with that of the Church so far as to admit Christ in name, and to recognise in words the necessity of divine help. For all but positive Atheists allow the advantage of help from that creative Spirit to which they refer the world's parentage. And there is little difficulty in supposing that Christ may be the channel through whom divine gifts are bestowed, seeing that they were once exhibited with peculiar lustre in Himself. But the characteristic distinction between the one system and the other is, that Rationalism makes the individual the starting-point for all improvement, whereas

the Church's starting-point is Christ. The first is for dealing with nature as it finds it; it takes man such as he is, with the powers and faculties which he possesses, and supposes that their cultivation may enable him to shake off the evils and infirmities which all deplore. The man himself, therefore, is the commencement of all renewal; he may use God's grace, indeed—he may invoke the name of Christ—but in himself is the ultimate principle of renovation. For as an individual is he addressed; his conversion must precede that relation to Christ which, according to Christians, is the principle of the new nature. The Church system, on the other hand, attributes the first renewal of man's race to the entrance into its ranks of a higher and supernatural Being. His quickening influence is the principle of regeneration to all His fellows. In Him, and not in them, is the original principle of movement. The restoration of the ancient pattern of man is not attained through the natural perfection of individuals, but because in Christ, Our Lord, was the personal presence of that Divine Word, which was above nature. He came down into our lower race to ennoble it. The change, therefore, in every individual must result from that diffusive influence of the second Adam, by which the exertion of individual intellect and will must be preceded. Thus does it continue to extend itself through that sacramental system, which binds all men to the head of the race; and the restoration of every man is due to that great gift which was bestowed upon our common nature through the Incarnation of Christ.

The contrast of these two systems may be traced through all their complicated relations. The Church system of education rests on the improvement of that renewed nature, which in Christ, Our Lord, has been bestowed upon His brethren. But Rationalistic education addresses itself to man as he is; it appeals at once to his natural gifts, and his intellectual endowments, as though these were a sufficient ground for his reform. And as the Church system has its basis in that truth of the Incarnation on which it rests the world's renewal, so Rationalism has

its real foundation in that theory of Pantheism which ends in deifying the natural powers of man. For, put the Incarnation out of view, and Pantheism is the natural resource of reflective minds. The wonderful mysteries of man's nature—the strange contrast of life and death, decay and reproduction—all these carry us on to the contemplation of those comprehensive laws of the physical universe, which ally themselves so singularly with the existence of mankind. They are reflected in the traditions of the past—they give deeper meaning to the mythology of ancient nations. They imply, that in man's life is a divine principle, akin to that all-embracing power which pervades the universe. But the true explanation of this deep secret is, not that man is naturally God, but that God has mercifully become man. The union between these two natures is real; the indications of what is high and holy in man's being need not be questioned. The principle of life, to which all primitive mythologies witness, which the ancient mysteries of Egypt and Greece were designed probably to illustrate, is truly a chain, which links us to the Almighty. It was no vain notion which taught men in early times, that it was a sacred principle which gave life to organic frames. But man could not thus ascend to God, until God the Word had first stooped to manhood. Whatever told of the nobility of man's race, was an anticipation of that wondrous work, which was to be fulfilled in its season. In Christ, all that is great in humanity finds its completion, because His coming gives the explanation of those principles which else seemed too large and noble for our being and state. Whatsoever visions of beauty and excellence have floated before the poet's mind, in Him only they have their fulfilment. "The Song of Songs" speaks of Him who is "the chiefest among ten thousand," and whose real kingship over all His brethren is reflected in the splendours of earthly royalty.

On this intimate relation between the Head and the members—between Him who entered the human family, that He might not only exhibit its capacities in their highest state, but bestow

upon it gifts of which it was before incapable—depends the efficacy of what Christ effected for man's nature in His death, and of what He "ever liveth" to effect for it through His intercession. But before we pass to the consequences of this great truth, we must set forth the truth itself, on which they are dependent. If such was Our Lord's participation in whatsoever belongs to humanity—if He was *the Pattern Man*, in whom humanity first attained its perfection, the consequence must have been a complete exhibition of those sympathies which characterize mankind. Again, the completeness with which He set forth the distinctive features of man's race would lead us to anticipate that, regarded as a man, there was some peculiar perfection in the constitution of His nature. And since it was the object of prophecy to witness His approach, it would bear testimony to that peculiar character in which He came, to that Office of the Pattern Man which it was His purpose to exhibit. These things go to make up that peculiar character of the head of Man's race, which He entered into our lower nature to maintain; and they require, therefore, to be severally set forth as portions of His human being. So that we proceed to show that Our Lord was the Pattern Man, the second Adam—first, by Office; secondly, by Nature; thirdly, by Sympathy.

CHAPTER II.

THE OFFICE OF CHRIST AS THE PATTERN MAN MARKED OUT IN ANCIENT SCRIPTURE.

Since Christ was, by Office, the Pattern Man, the functions which pertained to His character must have been indicated in those records of prophecy which announced His approach. Two points there were which required to be especially set forth—

first, that the recovery of man's race must be the result of some internal movement communicated to it; that it was not a mere withdrawal of those external inconveniences by which he was environed, but an actual improvement in the race itself: and secondly, that this movement, though existing within, must come from without him; that it was not the mere growth and development of his natural faculties, but some supernatural power, introduced into his fallen race by an external deliverer. These two conditions would be required, supposing that the deliverance, after which humanity was yearning, was to be brought about through the entrance into its ranks of some superior being, by whose communion it was to be raised above itself.

In the former half of those four thousand years which preceded the birth of Christ, the first of these truths was put before men. As the Fall had given occasion to Christ's coming, so from the very moment of the Fall was there this intimation of His approach. The Fall had been the breaking up of natural society: the failure of whatever might be expected from the original stock of mankind. His race was doomed to perish "like corn blasted before it be grown up." Death spiritual at once asserted its empire over the disobedient seed, and temporal death would have followed in its appointed season. But in the meantime came in that merciful promise, which opened a door of hope for the race of the offender, and asserted that by the woman's seed her serpent enemy should finally be subjugated. This promise found its completion in Christ; it was the first intimation that He should be the head and representative of His brethren. Yet this first promise was so large and general, that in itself it taught nothing except that the deliverance promised to man should arise from something which was bound up with the race itself, and should connect itself, therefore, with its collective character. By attaching the promise to the woman's seed, its giver bound it to the extension of society. And this is the reason, as St. Irenæus points out, why St. Luke, who wrote especially for Gentile readers, traces up the descent of Christ to Adam; his object

being to show that all nations, languages, and generations, were related to Him who is the new head of Adam's race, because they were united to Adam by common paternity.[1] But as yet there was no full intimation, so far as we read, respecting the nature of that deliverance, which the progress of society was to bring along with it; whether God's will was to save by one or many—by a gradual renovation of the whole kindred, or through the appearance of some selected combatant, who was to do battle against the common enemy.

There was the less danger, no doubt, in such an omission, because, while society was young, and while man's intellect had gained little ascendency over the external world, the idea of a self-dependent advancement, through his inward power, had no basis to rest upon. The Rationalistic notion, that man's regeneration may be effected through the progress of society, and the development of his natural powers, is the delusion of a cultivated age. In that simpler period of the world's history, the tendency was rather to such unfounded reverence for external objects, as issued in sensible idolatry. But there was enough to sustain faithful hearts, while the recollection of God's first dealings with mankind was fresh, and while the promise was so recent, that through some unknown working of His sovereign power, there should arise out of the race itself the means of its deliverance. Men's expectations showed themselves in such expressions as those of Eve at the birth of Cain; and the same hope probably was associated with the name of Noah, who was to comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.

But something more was required when the lapse of two thousand years had removed the first witnesses to God's dealings and promises, while, at the same time, the powers of man were strengthened by the growth of society and the advancement of knowledge. It became essential that the second part of God's

[1] S. Iren. iii. 22, 3, p. 219. Vide Sherlock on the *Immortality of the Soul*, cap. v. sec. 5, p. p. 407, second edition.

mystery should be unfolded; there needed an intimation that it was not through the natural development of humanity, but through the entrance into its ranks of some superior power, that its regeneration was to be effected. This was announced through the call of Abraham. As yet, men might still learn from Shem, what had been delivered to him by Methuselah and other contemporaries of Adam. Considering the advantages which the first man had possessed, through that acquaintance with God which was his singular privilege, it was impossible that the blessed hope of reconciliation, with all that it implied respecting man's original state and future prospects, should be forgotten by those who had heard it only at second-hand. But now, through the abridgment of man's life, this mode of instruction was about to be lost. The childhood of the human race was to merge in that busy manhood of crime and toil, which made up the two thousand years of heathenism. And therefore, when the course of events had rolled on from the Creation for about a similar period, it pleased God to select a particular family from among the children of men, to be the maintainers of His worship, and the depository of His promises. With Abraham began the peculiar privileges of the Church. Then was the witness of an institution substituted for that of individuals. And the promise that through his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed, was an indication that man's recovery should not be effected by the self-relying efforts of mankind, as they were scattered throughout the earth, but through a gift, which it would please God to bestow upon them through the one peculiar channel of his own election. The seed of Abraham was to be their common benefactor. Thus was it made known, that though the renewal of man was to work inwardly through some influence which was to express itself in the woman's seed, yet was it to be bestowed on that seed through one particular family, as an external gift. And this title to be the universal patron of the human race was confirmed by special promise to Isaac.[1] Now,

[1] Gen. xxvi. 4.

this promise must plainly look to that peculiar office, which was to be discharged by the coming Mediator, as the head of the human family: unless, indeed, it could be supposed that the restoration of man's race was to be the work of that favoured progeny, which inherited the distinction conferred upon their parents. For it might be alleged that the descendants of Abraham were designed to be a seed of hereditary nobles, like the Brahminical caste of India, through whom the degradation of the other children of Adam was hereafter to be redressed. Such was certainly the popular feeling among the Jews, and such is really the tendency of those carnal views of Scripture prophecy, which apply the predictions respecting Israel to the temporal seed of Abraham, and not to that true Israel, which is heir by grace to the Father of the Faithful. For Scripture speaks plainly of Israel as the salt of the earth and the head of the nations; and some such earthly superiority, therefore, would still await it, were not these predictions really applicable to those spiritual descendants of Abraham, "the Israel of God."[1] So St. Paul especially assures us, and he turns our thoughts therefore to that head and representative of our race, in whom the words of prophecy have their real fulfilment. As it was through their connection with Him who was to come, that Israel was formerly God's people, so does Scripture teach us that it is those who are members of Him who at present constitute the Israel of God. Since the advent of Christ, it is through union only with Him that men can be heirs of the promise to Abraham. In opposition to that carnal interpretation, which would appropriate the sayings of Scripture to the physical descendants of the Patriarch, St. Paul points out an express declaration in ancient prophecy, that the world-

[1] Gal. vi. 16. To suppose that the Jewish nation will hereafter be converted, as St. Paul appears to intimate, Rom. xi. 25, and that its conversion will be productive of blessings to the world at large, is not inconsistent with a belief that the spiritual *precedency* granted to the heirs of Abraham belong to his spiritual and not to his carnal progeny. "Nec hi tantum essent Israel, quos sanguis et caro genuisset, sed in possessionem hæreditatis fidei filiis præparatæ, universitas adoptionis intraret."—S. Leo, *Ser.* xxv. 2.

embracing benefits of his seed would not be connected with those many nations which were sprung from him according to the flesh, but with that single race, which was united to him through relation to an individual representative. "He saith not, and to seeds as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed,[1] which is Christ."[2] And that Abraham himself had discovered the meaning of this deep mystery, we are expressly informed, for "Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad."

That which was understood by the Father of the Faithful, was made still more manifest in a later generation, when it was predicted that He who should arise in Abraham's family should sit upon David's throne, and be the perpetual representative of his royalty. This marked out plainly the individual character of Him who was to come. And herein lies the fulness of that prophetic inspiration, which asserts the continuance of David's throne, and the perpetuity of his family. The perpetual use of the Psalms, according to the immemorial custom of the Church, must seem unmeaning to those who discern not the Gospel import of praying "for the peace of Jerusalem," and to whom the Church's *oneness*, as it is asserted in the Creed, is not a commentary on the declaration that "Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself." And so is it respecting those predictions of the head and deliverer of mankind, which were expressed in the shape of promises to David. We behold the Pattern Man in His office as the Son of David, when we testify that "they shall fear Thee, as long as the sun and moon endureth, from one generation to another." Or again, "His seed shall

[1] That Our Lord is in this verse identified with the members of His body mystical is subsequently noticed. A neological objection has been urged against St. Paul's argument, because, though the Greek word for seed is individual, yet the Hebrew זֶרַע which is used in the original promise, is collective, and does not, therefore, point out the *single* character of Christ as Abraham's representative. But the conditions of St. Paul's argument are fulfilled by the fact, that the promises to Abraham were confined to one out of the many races which were descended from him; and this race he affirms to consist of those spiritual descendants of the Father of the Faithful who make up the body of Christ.

[2] Gal. iii. 16.

endure for ever, and His seat is like as the sun before Me. He shall stand fast for evermore as the moon, and as the faithful witness in heaven." These references to material objects indicate, that the superiority here assigned belongs to some representative of our race who should share its *created* character. They claim for him certain rights (independently of the co-partnership of that deity, from which, as we are assured, He was never separate), in that He came to be heir of David's throne, and inheritor of the promises. In this character, "His name shall endure for ever: His name shall remain under the sun among the posterities, which shall be blessed through Him, and all the heathen shall praise Him." "All kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall do Him service; for He shall deliver the poor when he crieth, the needy also, and him that hath no helper. He shall live, and unto Him shall be given of the gold of Arabia: prayer shall be made ever unto Him, and daily shall He be praised." [1]

To such declarations the fond expectation of the Jewish nation still clings, and they cannot believe that sayings so express were not designed to receive an earthly fulfilment. The mere figurative interpretation of such promises seems cold and meagre. But a literal fulfilment they doubtless have, if the humanity of the Son of God be taken account of. It is through His character of the Pattern Man that He actually fulfils that office of Head or King of God's chosen people, to which ancient prophecy bore such inspiring witness. If the Church of Christ be really God's kingdom, where the Son of David rules over the Israel of His new election, whom He has redeemed to Himself through the waves of baptism, and is now leading in their weary journey through the wilderness of this world to the promised Canaan of their heavenly rest, then have the declarations of ancient Scripture a real accomplishment, and "Jerusalem, which is above," is the present "mother of us all." [2] If ever the light of Gospel truth

[1] Psalm lxxii. 5, 17, 11, 12, 15; Psalm lxxxix. 35, 36.
[2] Gal. iv. 26.

shall visit the eyes of God's earlier people, it must surely be by their abandoning the carnal expectations of earthly greatness, and yet adhering to the meaning of their ancient realities. If they would thus look at God's words, neither as a mere letter nor as an empty figure—they would discern the hidden reality of their hallowed system, they would find their own Jerusalem in the Church of God, the election perpetuated in her ranks, the Divine Presence manifested in her ordinances, the Son of David ever with her, "even to the end of the world," and "a new and living way into the holiest, consecrated for them through the vail, that is to say, His flesh."[1]

As the individual character of man's deliverer had been indicated by that throne, which was ascribed to Him as the successor of David, so was it declared in still more express words, when He was spoken of by that line of Prophets, who were types of Him in their witness and sufferings, but whose full object could not be attained, till He who had led them by the secret workings of His Spirit came in personal completeness into the world, "a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of His people Israel." As yet this light "shined in a dark place," and those who heard them might not unnaturally ask at times: "I pray thee, of whom speaketh the Prophet this, of himself, or of some other man?" To their own spirits, however, "it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported:" and their words intimate clearly the personal character of Him who was to arise as the restorer of His brethren. They had deep insight into the great truths, that the regeneration of man's race was not merely an outward benefit, attained through the withdrawal of physical evils, nor yet the result of the mere self-dependent exertions of our inner being, but that some actual power from without must enter into man's nature, and that in Him the long yearnings of humanity should find satisfaction.

[1] Heb. x. 20.

"There shall come forth," says Isaiah, "a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a *branch* shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him." This comparison is repeatedly employed, and is of singular significancy. It implies, that man's nature is shared in common by the whole human family; and that He who rises up out of it, on behalf of its other partakers, is, in some real manner, united to the parent stock, and, therefore, to all its branches. "Behold the *man*, whose name is the BRANCH, and He shall grow up out of His place, and He shall build the temple of the Lord: even He shall build the temple of the Lord, and He shall have the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne, and He shall be a priest upon His throne." [1] Or again, "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper." [2]

These passages look to the exaltation of man's nature, in the person of some favoured representative, who should obtain blessings for his whole race. And, therefore, the right of representing the root itself is attributed to this prosperous branch, in which the parent stock is resuscitated. For that which had been spoken of as a branch is immediately afterwards declared by the Prophet to be the root itself: "In that day there shall be a *root* of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious." [3] And thus was the prophecy interpreted to the beloved Disciple, since the "Lamb as it had been slain," by which is plainly indicated Our Lord, regarded according to His human nature, is declared to be the "Root of David." [4] Indeed, the word which our translators have understood *stem*, indicates the same conception; its literal meaning is that of a stem which has been cut down,[5]—a *stool*, as woodmen technically express it, which may serve the purpose of supplying a future plant. And thus are our thoughts led to the notion, which is otherwise given by

[1] Zech. vi. 12.
[2] Jer. xxiii. 5.
[3] Isaiah xi. 10.
[4] Rev. v. 5.
[5] "Abgehauener Stamm."—Gesenius, in loco.

Isaiah, in his fifty-third chapter, where the dry ground of man's nature is spoken of as germinant with the plant of our salvation: "He shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground."[1] This is He, then, of whom it is further spoken, "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." "Weigh the words," says Bishop Andrewes—"child is not said, but *in humanis*, among men."[2] Here, then, we have so many predictions of a personal inheritor of humanity, whose *office* should be to redeem and restore His race. Thus are we led to the contemplation of Him as that "Son of Man," which He is called in the New Testament—as the representative, that is, of man's nature, growing out of it to a glory which, in no other instance, it had acquired, and becoming a Head and Pattern, not only to the Jewish, but to the whole human family. For "to it shall the Gentiles look, and glory shall be its dwelling."

To follow up this subject, as it becomes manifest in the New Testament, would be to anticipate future parts of our inquiry, since it is impossible to separate the statement of Our Lord's Office from the considerations of those blessings which He conferred in its discharge. Here, therefore, it is enough to say, that He is expressly declared to be "the last Adam;" and that what was gained in Him is set against what was lost by His predecessor: "for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."[3] He is stated, according to His earthly nature, to be "the first-born of every creature;"[4] a passage which bears out the opinion of St. Athanasius, that the reference to the creation of wisdom in the Book of Proverbs is designed, among other things, to set forth the incarnation of our Lord, as the head or pattern of humanity. St. Athanasius, following the Septuagint, and expressing the Hebrew with more exactness than is done in our Translation,[5] renders Proverbs

[1] Isaiah liii. 2. [2] Sermon II.—Of the Nativity, p. 11.
[3] 1 Corinthians xv. 21, 45. [4] Colossians i. 15.
[5] The Hebrew word, קָנָה has for its original meaning, to set upright, and thence to build or make. This must be its signification in Deute-

viii. 22, "*The Lord created me a beginning of His ways*, which is equivalent," he observes, "to the assertion that the Father prepared me a body, and He created me for man, on behalf of their salvation."[1] And again, "Because the Son says, when He took on Him the form of a servant, *the Lord created me a beginning of His ways*, let not men deny the eternity of His Godhead."[2] By putting on our nature then did He become the type on which it was moulded. His discharging the function of priest, therefore, and His submitting to be our common sacrifice, are set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as consequent upon that undertaking for mankind at large, whereby the predictions, which had been uttered respecting the whole race, found their completion by being concentrated in His single person. "One in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that Thou art mindful of him; or the son of man, that Thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that He put all in subjection under him, He left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him: but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man."[3] Thus do those things, which were spoken of humanity at large, find their completion in Christ, because He, who *by office* is the Pattern Man, has a right to represent the rest.

ronomy xxxii. 6; Psalm cxxxix. 13; and probably also in Genesis xiv. 19, 22, where our translation following the Vulgate, renders it, as in this case, "possess." The Greek is ἔκτισεν.

"First-born," and "Beginning of His ways," would, in this case, be taken in the order of ideas rather than of time. Perhaps St. Paul speaks in the same way of the Fifth Commandment, as being the Foundation Commandment, with a promise. The Fifth Commandment is not the first in order which has a promise, but it is the *foundation* of our duty to our neighbour.

[1] Oratio II. contra Arianos, sec. 47, vol. i. p. 515; and also Athanasius's Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya, p. 317.

[2] Or. II. contra Ar. sec. 51, p. 518.

[3] Hebrews ii. 6–9.

CHAPTER III.

CHRIST, THE PATTERN MAN BY NATURE.

THE assertion that Our Lord was, *by office*, the Pattern Man, leads to the further inquiry, whether He was so merely by title or in reality. Might His office have been as fitly assumed by any besides Himself, or was He marked out for it by the constitution of His nature? Was He any otherwise the Pattern Man than Moses, who, in his day, was representative for his brethren? Could St. Peter or St. John have been chosen, with equal propriety, to be the new Head of man's race; or, in that case, could such words ever have been employed as, "Thou hast redeemed us by Thy blood;" or again, "My flesh[1] is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed"?

We proceed, then, to show that Our Lord was fitted, by His man's nature, for the office which He discharged; that *as man* He had a right to the title which He bore, and *was* what He passed for. The long predictions which taught that, in the fulness of time, a MAN should appear, whose office should be to restore His brethren, had their consummation in Him, because He and He only was qualified, by the constitution of His being, for the service which He rendered. And although this fitness resulted from the influence of that higher nature, which was associated with humanity in His sacred Person, yet it was a fitness which belonged to His man's nature in itself, and by reason of that peculiar manner in which He assumed it. Mediation was not a function which the Son of Man undertook from arbitrary choice, but one which he was *born* to discharge. For this end did His Godhead vouchsafe to mingle in our lower

[1] "Οὐ γὰρ ἡ Παύλου τυχὸν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἡ Πέτρου σάρξ τοῦτο ἐν ἡμῖν ἐργάσεται."—*St. Cyr. in Joan.* vi. 64, vol. iv. p. 376.

world; and for this end His manhood was purposely adapted. Now, the grounds of His peculiar fitness must be found by inquiring into the nature which He took, and into the manner in which He took it. We proceed, then, to the consideration of these questions:—First, What is meant by that human nature which Christ our Lord assumed? Secondly, What was there in His manner of assuming it, which made Him the peculiar pattern and representative of mankind? The settlement of these two questions is intimately connected with that which is termed by St. Paul "the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ," because they exhibit to us how "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." The inquiry is one which begins with a survey of our own being, but which speedily leads us up from God's works, as they are manifest in creation, to His word, as revealed in Holy Writ. The expectations of man show what is needed for the satisfaction of his wants, but it must be by some external agency that these wants can be remedied. Our inner feelings, our thoughts, views, hopes, and fears are, no doubt, an important element in our religion—they touch on the momentous question of our earnestness and sincerity. But all these are movements and affections which lie within ourselves. If Christ's service, however, be anything real—if there be truly a kingdom of heaven round about us—if there be such things as heaven and hell, angels and devils, God sitting upon His throne, the Lamb which was slain making intercession for His people—then are we likewise surrounded by a set of truths outside of ourselves, and these eternal realities press closely on the transitory concerns of this passing life. And our religious state must depend not only on our inward feelings, but also upon our actual relation to those external realities which are round about us.

The review of Our Lord's nature has its beginning, then, in a consideration of those observed wants of humanity which He came, as the child of promise, to supply; but it has its consummation in those higher mysteries, which have been revealed

to us as the method of supplying them. Out of this circumstance arises the extreme reverence which is due to the sayings of Scripture. Since its inspired words are our indication respecting that other world which is all around us, we cannot prize too highly even those occasional intimations which open vistas into the mighty depths of God's counsels. We are actually living in the midst of a divine and supernatural system. We know of it only through glimpses and by shadows. What so precious, then, as the sayings of those "whose eyes were opened," who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"! To this it is, then, that our inquiry into that human nature which was taken by Christ our Lord, must lead us up; in this it must terminate. We must imitate the great Prophet of nature:—"Thy creatures have been my books, but Thy Scriptures much more. I have sought Thee in the courts, fields, and gardens; but I have found Thee in Thy temples."

I. We see, then, a race of beings, extending through every part of the world, the members whereof resemble one another in features, organs, understanding, affections, and passions. This race we call collectively mankind. We see also in the world an abundance of other organized beings, which have a greater or less relation to man, and which, from the singular analogy which their bodily organs have to our own, are, in some respects, plainly creatures of the same hand, and parts of the same creation. All these obey this one singular law, that those only which appear to be derived from the same stock will multiply together. Consider their almost boundless number, the close resemblance which some of them bear to others, and the perfect subjection of so many of them to the caprice of man, and there is something amazing in that plastic nature which can maintain the almost imperceptible intervals between so many continuous lines of animal life, and reproduce the types of every kind in endless succession, without confusion, variety, or decay. This is one of God's great works, whereby He blends the supremacy of law and the prodigality of nature. From the lowest sponge

to the most complex mollusk, and thence to the numerous classes of the vertebrate kingdom, till we come to man—there is evidently some single principle, which shows itself in nothing so remarkably as in the perpetuation of the same type, amidst the various classes of co-ordinate beings. Even if their divisions were not referable, as most naturalists suppose, to the fact of a common descent, yet the existence of some such law is evidenced by that harmonious march which we witness in the tribes of animated nature from day to day. There is, likewise, the singular phenomenon, that qualities will sometimes come out in individuals of a race for which we cannot account, except by supposing them to have been buried, if such an expression may be used, in the collective nature, till favourable opportunities allowed them to reappear.[1] Abundant instances of the kind are afforded by the physical history of man.[2] To this principle we must refer the fact, that peculiarities which were accidentally present, as it would seem, in the heads of any particular subdivision of some natural class, are commonly, but not perpetually, transmitted to their descendants. Such circumstances are properties of particular families; but not having been originally bound up with the constitution of the race, they are not an indissoluble part of it.

We find the animal kingdom, then, pervaded by a mysterious law, which imposes unity of type upon all the classes which constitute it. And the analogy thus supplied seems as though intended to lead us on to the observation of the same fact, when we come to that highest portion of the animal kingdom, which God has endued with the faculties of reason, conscience, and love. In the case of man, likewise, we discern the fact of some rare principle of connexion, by which the individual members of his race are bound together, which constitutes them an actual

[1] Looking lower in the scale of creation, it is often observed that from two horses of the same colour will arise a progeny which bears no likeness at all to the colour of its parents.

[2] Vide Prichard's *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, Book ii. c. iv.

whole, and which shows itself in that uniformity of type which marks the perpetual ranks of their infinite succession. This principle of connexion is what we call *human nature*. Wherein this connexion consists can no more be explained, than wherein consists the union between the soul and the body. It depends not, of course, on physical contact, like that which exists between the waters of the great deep. It does not interfere with the separate life of each man's spirit, whereby has been assigned to him the momentous gift of that individual personality, for which he must render account at the great day. All that is asserted of it is that it is a real bond, by which every man is tied to that primitive type, which perpetuates itself in him and in all others. That we should have no powers of analysis, capable of ascertaining what this principle is, presents no just reason for denying its existence. What do we know of electricity except by its effects? The constant repetition of the same results, under similar circumstances, leads us to infer the existence of some real though imponderable agent. And the same conclusion seems justified, when we see the perpetual reappearance of the same type in those who are possessors of the same nature.

This subject needs more close consideration, because it has been supposed by some persons, that the belief in such a thing as *human nature* is essentially connected with the erroneous notions of the schoolmen, and implies that every class has, as its counterpart, some actual thing. "Each man," it is said, "is born with certain powers and dispositions, which constitute his own nature; and the resemblance of them in all his fellows produces a general idea, or a collective appellation, whichever we may prefer to say, called the nature of man." And therefore, Pascal is censured by Mr. Hallam, because he "seems never to have disentangled his mind from the notion, that what we call human nature has not merely an arbitrary and grammatical, but an intrinsic, objective reality."[1]

[1] *Literature of Europe*, iv. 160.

Before we consider the justice of this objection, it will be well to state more exactly the position of those who believe in the reality of that which is called *human nature*. It is not affirmed, then, that we can trace the connexion by which one man is bound to another, or analyze the mysterious principle of transmitted life, upon which it is dependent. Still less is it asserted that there is any independent force in the material substratum of man's being, which, by virtue of its innate efficacy, has the power of propagating life. It is probable that matter depends for its existence upon the constant efficacy of God's power and presence.[1] Were not He constantly present with the whole creation, it would seem that "its instant annihilation could not choose but follow." The continuity of our race does not depend, any more than the identity of an individual, on the sameness of the parts, which at any time make up man's body; indeed, one characteristic of it is, that the same portions of matter may pass successively through the whole series of the animal kingdom, without affecting the transmission of that impulse of life which is handed on from sire to son. "Why may not imagination trace the noble dust of Alexander, till he find it stopping a bunghole?" Again, it is not implied that there is any reality in human nature, distinct from the personal characteristics and conditions of the individuals who bear it. It is a principle which shows itself in many types, and exists in the varying types in which it shows itself. We cannot separate off anything, distinct from the constituent parts and qualities of each man, and say that it is the nature which is common to the race. What is it, then, that we affirm? On the fact that the same form continually appears we ground the probability that its reappearance depends on some unknown principle of connexion.

Appearances lead us to imagine that the whole series of man's

[1] This last is the principle of God's Immanence, as opposed to that Deistic theory of Transcendence which supposes that the qualities of matter having been bestowed upon it by its Maker, everything has been left to go on by the impulse which was originally bestowed.

race is in some sort an organized whole: its several possessors having an actual relation to one another. As the life of the foot is the same with that of the hand, because they belong to the same body; so, because all the children of Adam are members of one race, they are the channels through which is transmitted a single nature. The scriptural authority for this opinion shall be noticed shortly; at present let us consider its natural probability. Those who deny it, object to the assertion that man's race is to be looked upon as possessing a common organization. Though they may admit, therefore, that all men are corrupt, yet they appear to exclude the notion that original sin is a transmitted corruption. "Man's nature, as it now is," says Mr. Hallam, "that which each man and all men possess, is the immediate workmanship of God, as much as at his creation." On this principle, "the corruption of human nature" is stated to be a phrase which is "analogical and inexact." Now, though every individual specimen of humanity be God's creation, why should it not be His pleasure to exercise His creative powers according to the law of a natural interdependency? The foot and the hand are His work as much as the whole body; but they are not endued with a separate life, but with a life which is relative to the whole. In like manner, the preservation of the race of man is made to grow out of that quickening impulse which we call the life of humanity. This notion, which was called Traducianism by the schoolmen (the system opposed to it being termed Creatianism), has on its side an overwhelming amount of probabilities. If men throw dice several times upon a table, the determination of every cast is in God's hands; but because there is no law of interdependency in the action, the issue in each case is wholly uninfluenced by the case which preceded it. Every time they throw, the chances are the same that they were the first time. Now, unless there be some principle of interdependency among organized beings, why is not the same variety apparent? Why should not such anomalies as Virgil attributes to culture be the ordinary law?

Castaneæ fagos, ornusque incanduit albo
Flore pyri : glandesque sues fregere sub ulmis.

Unless some reason, therefore, can be assigned for the contrary, there is an infinite improbability in the application of Creatianism to the case of organized nature. And yet there is one case in which it seems necessary to admit it. There is one part of man's nature, the very existence of which depends so completely on its individual, uncompounded, independent action, that it seems impossible to refer it to the co-operating influences of human parentage. The *spirit*[1] of man, with its peculiar principle of personality, is generally supposed to be an immediate work of God's creative will ; although it be His will, in man's nature at large, to work according to the system of Traducianism. St. Augustine,[2] indeed, expresses himself as uncertain to the last, whether even the soul was an immediate creation; but the great majority of later writers agree in the opinion expressed by Günther :[3] "Traducianism has its function in respect to the animal (*psychische*) life of man ; on the other hand, the province of Creatianism is with his soul, and it would travel out of its province if it extended the immediate creative action of God to that animal life which is the principle of his body's existence."

[1] It may be thought inconsistent with the general argument of this work, to suppose that the Almighty interferes according to the law of Creatianism by birth, as He does according to the law of regeneration by baptism. But this principle is not contended for as respects the soul at large ; there may be enough to maintain its traditive character, even though Personality be supposed to be incapable of being transmitted. It is certain that He who took our whole nature did not take the principle of Personality according to the law of Traducianism; but that "antequam ab illo forma servi esset accepta, nondum fuerit Christus, sed tantummodo Verbum."—*Vigilius c. Eutych.* iv. 5. "Ut per se sibi assumsit ex virgine corpus, ita ex se sibi animam assumpsit."—*S. Hilar. de Trin.* x. 22.

[2] "Quod attinet ad animæ originem, utrum de illo uno sit, qui primum creatus est, quando factus est homo in animam vivam, an similiter ita fiant singulis singuli ; nec tunc sciebam, nec adhuc scio."—*St. Aug. Retrac.* i. 1, sec. 3.

St. Hilary expresses the more predominant opinion, that "anima omnis opus Dei sit, carnis vero generatio semper ex carne sit."—*De Trin.* x. 20.

[3] *Vorschule zur speculativen Theologie,* vol. ii. p. 181, Letter 8.

Some of the most striking arguments for this view of things are derived from the relation of man to that inferior world of organized life, of which his creation was the conclusion and crown. The singular identity of arrangement which pervades the whole series of living things; the very lowest possessing in rudiment every part and principle which belongs to the body of the highest, marks them out as subject to one universal law. Let us descend the scale, then, till we reach those inferior beings, in whom the unvaried arrangements of physical structure appear under their simplest conditions. Now, in their case we actually discern that continuity, for the existence of which, though after a different manner, we contend in the case of mankind. The law of Traducianism cannot be questioned in the case of the polyp, whose body is often an actual fragment of the body from which it is derived. The same principle may be discerned in this case as in that of the graft or sucker, which existed in its perfect state as a partaker of life, of which, when transplanted, it becomes, in its turn, the parent. If we admit this principle in the lower ranks of animal life, how can we deny its application to the higher? Nor can an external truth be destroyed by the logical difficulty which may attach to its expression. The objection brought against the actual existence of human nature is, that since it is only an abstraction formed by ourselves from a variety of examples, there can be no *real thing* intended by it; to give it actual existence is supposed to be the error of the Realists, who attributed an objective existence to those universal conceptions, which were only the creatures of their own minds. Hence, the reality of human nature, as a thing existing in the external world, is denied, because to assert reality for the idea of it in our own minds would be contrary to that system of Nominalism, which is recognized by logicians. But this is to abuse the principles of Nominalism on one side, as the opposite principle of Realism has been abused on the other. That many objects can be united by our classing them under a common idea does not give them any real objec-

tive union; but neither does it take that union away, provided that by other means it can be shown to exist. Yet this is the argument of those who, on principles of Nominalism, deny the objective existence of human nature. They pass over the distinction between such classifications as men make for themselves by an inward act of reasoning, and such as have been provided in the external world by God's Providence. The one are only our own internal acts; the other have an external existence. The error of the Realists was encouraged, according to Archbishop Whately,[1] by observation of those organized beings, which are bound together by the unalterable laws of nature. That in these cases there existed a real, though unknown bond, which maintained the perpetuity of the class, led men to attribute an objective existence to their own abstractions. But if no real connexion had united these external objects, the sight of them would not have led any one astray. When we class together philosophers or physicians, we bestow a common name upon those who are associated by their dispositions or employments. There is no connexion between them, distinct from the thoughts and actions to which the individuals described choose to addict themselves. There is a real similarity in their doings, supposing the class to be happily designated; but it is a similarity only, and at their will they may cease to resemble one another. It would be a vicious Realism, therefore, to assert the existence of an objective connexion among these parties, because we can embrace them under a common idea; but it would be an equally vicious Nominalism to deny an objective reality, where an inherent law prevents the possibility of such re-arrangement, and confines individuals to the peculiar classes to which they severally belong. The first would be to claim for our own mind the power of making its inward ideas into external realities; the second would be to deny the existence of external realities, because we have not the power of making them. We have no

[1] Whately's *Logic*, p. 260.

right, therefore, to deny the existence of a common nature[1] in those who are derived from a common origin ; whose union does not depend upon their voluntary combination, and cannot be dissolved by their own will. In such a case, then, it would not be contrary to reason to suppose that the nature transmitted was susceptible of improvement or deterioration ; so that its collective state might be found to be the result of all those impulses, which had been bestowed upon it by its innumerable possessors, since it came first from its maker's hands. Such impulses must, of course, be most potent, independently of higher considerations, in its earliest stages, when as yet it was centred in a single pair, both because it was without previous bias, and because there could be no one whose descent was not derived from its first possessors. But the very existence of such a deterioration implies, of course, the reality of that common being which links together every child of Adam.

But the community of nature must not be confined merely to that animal side of man's being, on which he touches upon the

[1] "It is certain that God created not only *individuals*, but the *several kinds*, with the differences which they have from each other; it is certain that these differences do not lie in mere *names* or *ideas*: how comes it, then, not to be certain that there is a Real Common Essence or Nature in the individuals of the same kind?"—*Stillingfleet's Answer to Locke's Letter*, *Works*, vol. iii. p. 551. Vide also *Answer to Locke's Second Letter*, vol. iii. pp. 605, 609. The assertion in the text is, that while we cannot claim reality for the generalizations of our own minds, we have no right to deny the existence of that unknown principle of connexion, which is attested by the permanence of nature. This distinction is confirmed by Aristotle. He divides substances, *οὐσίαι*, in primary and secondary. By primary, he means individuals; by secondary, classes. The first, he observes, have each a particular counterpart in nature, *τόδε τι σημαίνει*. The second have not so strictly a counterpart in nature, but yet are not mere qualities. But respecting these secondary substances, or classes, he observes that the name of *substance* does not so properly belong to the artificial genera, which men may create by abstraction, as to those ultimate species, which cannot become genera themselves, that is, which are incapable of subdivision. It is not to the present purpose to inquire how far he may have designed to carry this principle, but, so far as regards the animated kingdoms, his statement is identical with the assertion in the text. "Τὸ *εἶδος τοῦ γένους μᾶλλον οὐσία. Αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν εἰδῶν, ὅσα μὴ ἐστι γένη οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἕτερον ἑτέρου οὐσία ἐστίν.*"—*Κατηγορίαι*, Sec. 3.

brute creation. What is the meaning of all conference and concert among men, unless there be a real unity in the higher part of their constitution? The instinctive belief in such a union lies too deep, surely, to be the mere result of observation. There is a moral instinct, by which we feel assured that the sentiments which live in our own heart, will be responded to in that of our brother. The man must be cold and faithless who could enjoy life without such confidence. Even our judgments about the material world assume the existence of principles common to us all. Coincidence, resemblance, and proportion, the three keys to our knowledge of creation, require to exist within us, in order to be called forth. Any one will discern this who attempts to demonstrate, properly speaking, the Fourth Proposition of the First Book of Euclid. But much more may the same be observed respecting our judgment on the great truths of morals. Here it is, especially, that we bear witness continually to the possession of a common nature. Ingratitude and oppression, justice and truth—and the feelings of which these are the natural objects—testify clearly to some close alliance, which binds together all the far-severed scions of the family of mankind.

Independently of our conviction, that our opinions have such truth and rectitude as must commend them to higher beings, there is a principle of sympathy in our judgments, which irresistibly enforces upon us the kindred character of our minds. When Milton describes Adam's intercourse with an angel, he is compelled to seek for that principle of connexion in gratitude to a common Creator, which some inherent law of union produces of itself among mankind:

> "Only this I know,
> That one Celestial Father gives to all."

So that, however strong may be the arguments for Creatianism in respect to some part of our spiritual constitution, we cannot doubt that a connecting principle either binds together these

more subtile parts of man's being, or that they are influenced by the alliance of that with which they are united.[1] How close is the connexion which may often be traced, even in mental qualities, between the inheritors of the same blood. True, they resemble one another most closely in such parts of their mental constitution as most border upon physical being—in memory, for example—in habits—in hand-writing; but such things are surely some reflection of what lives within. And then rising from the family to the race, the calculations which are founded on the acts and opinions of men indicate as wonderful an accordance in the judgment of mankind, regarded as a whole, as we find dissimilarity through the eccentricities of individuals. By some this has been carried so far, that tables have been drawn up, on which it is stated that considerable reliance may be placed, with a view to estimate the probable moral conduct of a number of individuals.[2] This has been thought to militate against the reality of man's spiritual nature. Yet what does it show in reality, but that the same unity which belongs so clearly to the animal nature, extends itself likewise to the spiritual part of man? Our knowledge of immaterial, like our knowledge of material essences, is drawn only from observation; each has its laws and mode of action; and those who would materialize spirit, go no further in settling the perplexities of our compound nature than those who would spiritualize matter. The fact, therefore, remains where it was before; both our outer and inner being testify to the existence of a relation between the different members of the family of man. It may be that our inner being is in part handed down from one to another—in part derived from that creative impulse which gives each of

[1] "The Pelagian can form no other estimate of humanity than as a mass of co-ordinate independent spiritual individuals; in virtue, as in sin, every one stands and falls by himself. The Augustinian cannot think of it except as a collective community, the individual members whereof are not separate independent wholes, but integral portions of the totality." *Olshausen on Rom.* v. 12.

[2] Vide an extract from the *Dublin Review* for August, 1840, in *The Vestiges of Creation*, p. 333, second edition.

us a personal life. But whatever theory be adopted on this subject, the facts of the case testify to the existence of one common life, and this common life we call human nature.[1]

It may be said that the preceding considerations do not disprove the system of Creatianism; for why may not like produce like, though no such entity as human nature be admitted? No attempt has been made to disprove this system, as being incapable either of proof or of refutation. What has been maintained has been, first, that the logical objection to Traducianism, which is built upon the system of Nominalism, is inconclusive; secondly, that probability is infinitely in favour of Traducianism, except in regard to a certain principle of Personality, which has the appearance of being a distinct and original essence. For if no reason is known why like should produce like, the chances are infinitely against such a result, and in certain other cases, of an analogous character, an actual *traduction* can be discerned. To say that for like to spring from like may be a law imprinted by the Creator's will, would be to concede the point under discussion; since what is meant by a traditive nature, except that God has bound successive generations to the primary pair by a law of continuity? But for the *proof* that men are really associated by this inexplicable law, we can refer only to Holy Scripture, as being

[1] "In Adam the original material of humanity, in Christ the original idea of it in the divine mind, have a personal existence. In them it Humanity concentrated, and therefore is Adam's sin the sin of all, and Christ's offering an universal atonement. Every leaf of a tree may flourish and wither by itself, but all suffer from the decay of the root, and profit by its recovery. The more superficial a man is, the more isolated will everything seem to him, for on the surface all things are detached. In mankind, in the nation, even in the family, he will see nothing but individuals, whose actions are altogether distinct. The deeper a man is the more conscious will he be of those inward principles of unity which radiate from the centre. Even the love of our neighbour is only a deep feeling of this unity, for a man does not love those to whom he does not perceive and feel himself bound. Unless sin could come through one and through one atonement, there could be no understanding the command to love our neighbour."—*Stahl's Phil. des Rechts, quoted by Olshausen on Rom.* v. 12.

the sole document which professes to give us an authoritative explanation of man's nature. Now, to what purpose is the history of the race traced to its earliest origin—a thing towards which all heathen mythologies were tending, but which Scripture alone attains—unless its fortunes were regarded as a whole, and it must stand or fall together? Again, what means the statement, that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," unless there be some real connexion between the sons of men, whereby the acts of one affect another? For the Apostle expressly observes, that his statement is not confined to those whose voluntary acts might have been imitations of their predecessor. This explanation might perhaps be alleged as a ground for the sinfulness of responsible agents. But are not sin and death inseparably united? And how, then, do we account for the sufferings and death of unconscious infants? "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."[1]

Again, the same truth is alluded to, when the Apostle tells us, that "as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him."[2] The introduction shows, indeed, that the statement is used in way of illustration. Yet there must be a reality which it is intended to illustrate. That reality lies in the actual connexion by which the parties described were bound together. Had there been no such actual connexion, the expression had been forced and hyperbolical. The use of so strong a term shows that we are dealing with the case of things which are not only associated together, so that we can refer them to the same class, but which are united by some actual bond to one another. There is set before us the case of a great family, commencing from the earliest period of recorded time, and extending throughout all portions of the earth. It has an actual reference to one common ancestor, and its connexion is analogous to that interdependency of structure which

[1] Romans v. 12, 14. [2] Hebrews vii. 9, 10.

unites the different portions of an organic agent into a co-ordinate whole. Now, into this family it was that Christ Our Lord was pleased to enter. When He took man's nature, He vouchsafed to ally Himself to all members of this extended series, by the actual adoption of that transmitted being which related Him to the rest. He not only became like men, and dwelt among them, but He became man itself—an actual descendant from their first progenitor. *He was made man.* The Heathen notions of divine succour either looked to the elevation of some man to a divine eminency, or to the depression of some god to the level of mankind. But it was reserved for the Gospel to declare that God had actually become man, that He had really entitled Himself to a share in the hereditary characteristics of this lower being, and qualified Himself for co-partnership with His brethren.

Now, this is the fact declared, when it is stated that Christ took man's nature: it implies the reality of a common humanity, and His perfect and entire entrance into its ranks. Thus did He assume a common relation to all mankind. This is why the existence of human nature is a thing too precious to be surrendered to the subtilties of logic, because upon its existence depends that real manhood of Christ which renders Him a co-partner with ourselves. And upon the reality of this fact is built that peculiar connexion between God and man, which is expressed by the term Mediation. It looks to an actual alteration in the condition of mankind, through the admission of a member into its ranks in whom, and through whom, it attained an unprecedented elevation. Unless we discern this real impulse which was bestowed upon humanity, the doctrines of Atonement and Sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology. That "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," implies an actual acceptance of the children of men, on account of the merits of one of their race; as well as an actual change in the race itself, through the entrance of its nobler associate. The work of man's redemption and renewal is a real

work, performed by real agents. It is not only that the Almighty was pleased to save appearances, if we may so express it, by conceding to the representations of a third party what He did not choose otherwise to yield or to acknowledge (as Queen Philippa prevailed over her harsher husband, Edward); but Christ's Incarnation was a step in the mighty purposes of the Most High, whereby all the relations of heaven and earth were truly affected. To deny, as is done by Bishop Hampden,[1] "that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done," would be to resolve this real series of acts into a mere technical juggle. But to the reality of this work, the existence of that common nature is indispensable, whereby "as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He Himself took part of the same." Else, how would the perfect assumption of humanity have consisted with His retaining that Divine personality, which it was impossible that He should surrender? Since it was no new person which He took, it can only have been the substratum, in which personality has its existence. For His Incarnation was not the "conversion of Godhead into flesh, but the taking of the manhood into God." Or how could He have entered into a common relation to mankind in general, unless there had existed a common nature as the medium of union? This nature, which exists only in individual persons, He took for the earthly clothing of that divine personality in which He must ever continue to exist.

What Christ associated to Himself, therefore, was no individual man, but that common nature of which Adam was the first example. "It was not any human person in particular," says Bishop Beveridge, "but the human nature [which] He assumed into His sacred person."[2] "'The Word' (saith St. John) 'was made flesh and dwelt *in us*.' The Evangelist useth the plural number, men for manhood, *us* for the nature whereof we consist, even as the Apostle, denying the assumption of

[1] *Bampton Lecture*, v. p. 252.
[2] *On Third Article*, Works, ix. 115.

angelical nature, saith likewise in the plural number, 'He took not *angels*, but the seed of Abraham.'[1] It pleased not the Word or Wisdom of God to take to itself some one person amongst men, for then should that one have been advanced which was assumed, and no more; but Wisdom, to the end she might save many, built her house of that nature which is common unto all—she made not *this* or *that* man her habitation, but dwelt *in us*. The seeds of herbs and plants at the first are not in act, but in possibility, that which they afterwards grow to be. If the Son of God had taken to Himself a man now made and already perfected, it would of necessity follow, that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming, and the other assumed; whereas the Son of God did not assume a man's person unto His own, but a man's nature to His own person, and therefore took *semen*, the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence."[2]

II. We conclude, then, that there is such a thing as that common nature of man which is handed down through an innumerable series of personal inheritors; and further, that He who was personally God, took His place in this series by Incarnation, and thus assumed a common relation to all its possessors. It remains to show, in the second place, what was that peculiarity in His manner of taking manhood, which rendered this divine partaker of our nature the proper head and representative of the rest. That He would be greater, wiser, purer, than others is manifest; but why was He their natural representative? What fitted Him to answer for the rest? The nobler member who is adopted

[1] The marginal reading, "He taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham He taketh hold," is no doubt the literal rendering of the Greek original of Heb. ii. 16. The rendering in the text, however, which is the traditional one, stands to the literal one, as the context shows, in the relation of effect to cause, since it was because "the children are partakers of flesh and blood," that "He also Himself likewise took part of the same." And, therefore, the argument of the text is not impaired by the mistranslation.

[2] *Eccles. Pol* v. 52-3.

into an earthly fraternity, has more influence than his brethren; but he does not become their representative, unless so constituted by their voluntary act. What was there in Christ's manner of adopting our being, which marked Him out from others; so that when He was pleased to introduce Himself into the family of human beings, He became at once "the first-born of every creature," "the beginning of the creation of God"? Now, this question is answered in Holy Scripture, when the name of "the *last Adam*" is bestowed upon Him. Hereby we learn that those circumstances which rendered Adam the type and head of man's race are exhibited again in more perfect measure in the man Jesus Christ. The relation of Adam to the race of which he was the first example, is witnessed by the use of his name in the Hebrew language, as a generic title for the human family. Not only is Adam the word employed, when it is said "let us make *man*;" but the article prefixed to his name (in cases where our version gives no indication of it) implies that he was *the man*, the head or representative of humanity.[1] The grounds of this relation to mankind at large are twofold: First, the tie of common parentage, on account of which "*the man* called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living;" and secondly, that he was the type who represented the race in its perfection. "The Lord fashioned *the Adam* who was dust from the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *the Adam* became a living soul." An ingenious writer makes it an argument against the genuineness of the book of Genesis "as we have it," that there is here "an obvious attempt to biographize the protogonous and archetypal man;"[2] but those who are content to take Scripture as they find it, will recognize in this circumstance the real connection between the archetype and his descendants. And such a connection is a necessary preparation for the great antitype of our first parent—the new man Jesus Christ. And if His relation to His brethren

[1] Vide Genesis ii. 19, 20, 21; iii. 8; and iv. 1.
[2] *Vindication of Protestant Principles*, p. 140.

is to be as perfect as that of the first Adam, it must rest on the same conditions—He must be the stock from whom all are descended, and the new type after which they are to be formed. Now, the first of these grounds of connexion shall be touched upon hereafter, when we speak of that Sacramental union whereby men are united to Christ. "The words of Adam," says Hooker, "may be fitly the words of Christ concerning His Church, 'flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bones,' a true native extract out of mine own body."[1] But what is asserted in this chapter is, that the new Adam was as truly the type and pattern of the renewed, as the old Adam of the first creation. Thus did He occupy a place corresponding to our original father, and become, though in a different manner, the representative of the race. Had He been only a common man, however remarkable, He could not be placed in opposition to our first parent, who was both the fountain of our being, and the perfect specimen on whom the rest were moulded. Hereafter we shall trace the principle of affinity which binds Him to His earthly brethren: at present it shall be shown, that as Adam was the type in which man was originally made, so Our Lord, regarded according to His human being, was the fresh type, on which was remodelled the nature of mankind.

The first step in this inquiry is to consider more fully how Adam was the type in which humanity was originally made; and thus we shall be led to discern that corresponding place which is occupied by the purer and nobler type of manhood—the man Christ Jesus. For adopting this course there is great authority. "You may wonder," says St. Athanasius, "why, when we have proposed to treat of the Incarnation, we now discuss the origin of man. Yet to do so is nowise alien from our purpose. For it is necessary that, in treating of Our Lord's appearance among us, we should first consider the origin of man."[2] What was there peculiar then in Adam? Wherein

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 56–7.
[2] *De Incarnatione*, sec. 4, vol. i. p. 50.

did the Protoplast, as Bishop Bull calls him, after St. Irenæus, differ from us all? His constitution, like ours, consisted of body, soul, and spirit. The first and second of these were the seat of appetite—of that capacity of admitting material impulses which, in itself, is neither virtuous nor sinful. Adam ate in Paradise; Eve discerned what was "good for food." It was not till an act of disobedience had separated man from God that appetite degenerated into concupiscence. Its sinfulness arises from its being ungoverned, as more or less it is, in all the sinful progeny of Adam.[1] "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind."[2] Again, the soul and spirit of man were the seat of the various passions and affections, while conscience and will belonged especially to the spirit. Wherein lies that personality which makes each man a separate individual, and thus responsible for the deeds done in the body, before the throne of God, it is vain to conjecture. Of all our constituent parts, *will* seems the most to resemble it; yet even, *will* it is not, for in Christ was one person, yet two wills. Neither is it the same thing with conscience, however closely they are combined. Enough that it is a principle unlike aught besides in the universe, except it be found in those spiritual essences which exist along with and around us in the creation of God.

Now, in Adam, all these parts of our nature were not only good in themselves, but they were happily co-ordinated, the one to the other.[3] Appetite was not rebellious against reason, nor

[1] "Concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin"—Art. ix—a declaration not identical with the statements of the Council of Trent, but opposed to the ordinary Protestant Confessions.

The words of the Augustan Confession are: "Quod hic morbus, seu vitium originis, vere sit peccatum," &c.—*Sylloge Conf.* p. 123.

The Westminster Confession says: "Both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin."

On the other hand, the Council of Trent says: "Concupiscentiam Ecclesiam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat."—*Sess.* v. sec. 5.

[2] Rom. vii. 22, 23.

[3] Genesis i. 31.

passion against conscience. So that not only were the parts of his constitution excellent, as being the workmanship of God Himself, but the man who resulted from their union was good also. And this it is which is wanting in Adam's descendants, and which is expressed by that corruption [1] of nature, in which they are declared to be born. Not, of course, that the constituents of our nature can change their character, since they are either indifferent, like the bodily appetites, or good, like the moral virtues; but they become evil *in us*, because the general disorganization of our constitution diverts each of them from their proper aim and service. To eat is not sinful, nor the appetite of hunger—but gluttony, whether in will or deed. How could the half-frozen inhabitants of Greenland have been affected, as the Moravians witness, at the declaration of our Lord's sufferings for the sins of men, unless there were some such principle as gratitude remaining in our constitution? And if these principles remain, they cannot have turned round and changed their nature; man's fault is, not that he feels gratitude or love, but that his love is so weak, and that his gratitude is not proof against temptation. The corruption of nature, then, does not lie in these separate portions of it, but in that perversion of man, as a whole, by which their harmony is disturbed, and their purposes frustrated. Therefore, a woe [2] is denounced in Scripture against those who deny the truth of these constituent parts of the witness of man's conscience. For if there be no truth in such inward admonitions, what do we mean by speaking of good or evil; and why are we bound to adopt the one and eschew the other? This was the result to which the Manichæans were led, by supposing human corruption to lie, not in the actings of man as a whole, but in the constituent parts of his nature. The source of evil was traced back from man to his author, [3] and he was alleged to be the work of that evil spirit,

[1] Psalm li. 5. [2] Isaiah v. 20.

[3] "οὕτω γ' ἂν ἐπὶ τὸν δημιουργὸν ἡ κατηγορία τῆς φύσεως ἐπανίοι, εἴ τι τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν ὡς αἰσχρὸν καὶ ἀπρεπὲς διαβάλλοιτο."—*S. Greg. Nyssen. Cat. Orat.* sec. 28, vol. iii. p. 88.

whose impress was supposed to be visible in the elements of his nature.

Human corruption, then, lies in man himself, in the compound creature, who was created good but chose evil. Adam, on the other hand, came from his Maker's hands in the purity of innocence. The compound creature was good. The whole being was in harmony with that higher part of it, which was intended to sway; while all the propensions and appetites moved along with it in happy subordination. He needed corroboration, but not improvement. Yet whence was it that he had light for the guidance of his being? Can man, who is a creature, have light in himself? Is not the light of the moral as well as of the physical world an emanation from the fountain of light? The very Heathen had a conviction that man's nature could not be developed in its fullest proportions without such external aid: "Nemo sine aliquo afflatu divino vir magnus unquam fuit." Conscience, that is, appears to tell us that a moral being cannot attain to perfection without the co-operation of that Infinite Being in whom perfection is innate. In Adam, therefore, there must have been superadded, to those natural qualities which have been described, some supernatural gift, for the guidance of the whole.[1] Otherwise man would have

[1] In affirming that original righteousness is a supernatural gift, it seems improper not to notice the objection taken against the assertion by so high an authority as Dr. Jackson. His objection rests upon the belief, that supposing original righteousness supernatural, "this grace or quality might have been, or rather was, lost, without any real wound unto our nature." It is obvious, therefore, that his objection attaches not to the idea, that original righteousness was so high a gift that it transcended the inherent efficacy even of unfallen nature, but to the notion that nature was, in itself, something perfect and entire without such addition. Such an idea was attributed to some of the schoolmen, who are alleged by Archbishop Laurence to have thought supernatural grace a "superinduced ornament, the removal of which could not prove detrimental to the native powers." That such was the opinion which Dr. Jackson was opposing, is obvious from his own words, "that the righteousness wherein Adam was created was a natural endowment in respect of the essential quality produced, albeit the manner of producing it were somewhat more than supernatural." —[B. x. 3, 1, vol. ix. p. 9.] Now, this is all which is assumed in the present argument. The purpose of Jackson was not to exalt the natural

approached too near to such independent and self-originating action, as St. Athanasius[1] reminds us does not belong even to the angels; he would have been an efficient cause, a sort of demi-god. "Quicquid a Deo non pendet, ut auctore et principio, per nexus et gradus subordinatos, id loco Dei erit, et novum principium, et *Deaster* quidam."[2] "Man's nature," said the Anti-Pelagian Fathers at the Council of Orange (Canon 19), "even if it remained in that entireness in which it was created, could never preserve itself without its Creator's help."[3] There must have been some divine principle in man—some supernatural gift, superadded to the constitution of his nature. And such we are told there was. For not only did God create "man out of the dust of the earth," thus giving him body, and breathe "into his nostrils the breath of life," whereby he "became a living soul," but He also created man in His own image—"in the image of God created He him." Now, since "God is a

powers of man, but to maintain, that by the Fall he was not only deprived of a valuable auxiliary, but that (except so far as God should help him) he lost that which was indispensable to the practice of virtue. This seems to be conveyed by the statement of Aquinas, "homo per peccatum originale *spoliatur in gratuitis, vulneratur in naturalibus*." And it is expressed with great clearness by a writer, to whom, when treating on this very subject, Jackson refers with high commendation—"that reverend and great divine, Dr. Field, then Dean of Gloucester."—*Jackson* x. 13, 7, vol. ix. p. 78.

"Original righteousness is said to be a supernatural quality, because it groweth not out of nature; because it raiseth nature above itself; but it is natural, that is, required to the integrity of nature.

"Neither should it seem strange to any man, that a quality not growing out of nature should be required necessarily for the perfecting of nature's integrity; seeing the end and object of man's desires, knowledge, and actions, is an infinite thing, and without the compass and bounds of nature. And therefore the nature of man cannot, as all other things do, by natural force, and things bred within herself, attain to her wished end; but must either by supernatural grace be guided and directed to it, or, being left to herself, fail of that perfection she is capable of, and fill herself with infinite evils, defects, and miseries."—*Field on the Church*, Book iii. c. xxvi.

[1] They are not, he says, efficient causes [ποιητικὸν αἴτιον], so as to be able to co-operate along with God as independent beings, in the work of man's salvation."—*Or. III. cont. Arianos*, sec. 14.

[2] Bacon's *Meditationes Sacræ*.—Works, v. 530.

[3] Harduin's *Conc.* ii. p. 1100. Vide Bull's *Appendix ad Examen Animad.* xvii. 6.

spirit," this must refer especially to the nature and constitution of man's mind. Its essence, that is, must be in those things which especially characterize man's spirit—the conscience, namely, and the will. Yet the language of Scripture leads us to give it a wider scope, as embracing all the excellencies, both outward and inward, with which man's nature was endowed. For, from the supremacy of his mind proceeds the power of which even his lower nature is possessed. Herein lies that mysterious principle of Will, which renders his senses and members its instruments. So that three effects are derived especially from the gift of God's image: first, Lordship over the earth and lower animals;[1] secondly, Knowledge of God's works in creation, with which the possession of language was intimately connected;[2] thirdly, Intercourse with God, from whom man received direct instructions respecting his conduct.[3] Now, of these three things, the last seems to have been that of which sin most completely deprived him. Approach to God, the true fountain of knowledge; the opportunity of intercouse with Him; the derivation of perfect wisdom from His infinite into our contracted nature, was the first thing which sin rendered impossible. Hence did Adam hide himself from God's immediate presence; and Cain declared that its final loss was the consummation of his punishment:—"From Thy face shall I be hid."[4] To this source even nature points, as the ultimate origin of knowledge.

"Dixitque semel nascentibus auctor
Quicquid scire licet."

This it is which renders the creatures worthy of our study: they are the handiwork of Him in whose knowledge is the perfection of wisdom. The infinite extent of His kingdom leads our thoughts to Him who is as multiform in His works as He is simple in His ways. And the restoration of this intercourse is the measure of man's recovery, for "this is life

[1] Genesis i. 28.
[2] Genesis ii. 19.
[3] Genesis ii. 16.
[4] Genesis iii. 8, and iv. 14.

eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

This effect of God's image was lost by sin, by which that image in general suffered detriment. Therefore it is declared, in a marked manner, that "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image."[1] Yet that God's image was not altogether lost is plainly declared in Scripture. For when murder was forbidden after the Flood, the ground of its enormity is referred to that original construction of man in God's image, which would have ceased to be a reason for his preservation, if it had been altogether withdrawn.[2] The same conclusion may be derived from the reference to this principle, as an argument against detraction,[3] and as sanctioning the arrangements of domestic life.[4] This partial loss of a principle which is not totally forfeited, led some of the ancient writers to discriminate between God's *likeness*, which was lost by sin, and His *image*, which was still retained. The distinction is especially maintained by the Alexandrian Fathers. And St. Cyril of Jerusalem says, "God's *image* man received at the Creation; but his *likeness* he obscured through disobedience."[5] And so says Tertullian: "What comes from God is not so much extinguished as overshadowed. It can be overshadowed, because it is not God: it cannot be extinguished, because God gave it."[6] The image of God, therefore, remains as that principle of conscience which St. Paul vindicates even for the heathen world.[7] And "Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me."[8] But is this "work of the law, written in their hearts," an *implanted* or an *imparted* gift; is it a power of judging with which God endowed men, and then left them to themselves; or is it the result of His remaining presence? It must plainly have been from the first an indwelling, not an

[1] Genesis v. 3.
[2] Genesis ix. 6.
[3] James iii. 9.
[4] 1 Cor. xi. 7.
[5] Catech. xiv. 10.
[6] *De Anima*, 41.
[7] Romans ii. 15.
[8] Romans x. 20.

implanted gift, because it is declared to have been the indwelling of that principle of life which is inherent in the Eternal WORD. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." And to be an independent, original source of life, is an incommunicable attribute of self-existent GODHEAD; for it belonged as an especial gift to Him in whom the Spirit dwelt without measure. "For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He *given* to the Son to have life in Himself." That which was bestowed then as a peculiar attribute on the Son Incarnate, could belong to man only as an indwelling gift by supernatural communication. So that our first parents, as St. Chrysostom says, "were clothed with glory from above."[1] And St. Athanasius speaks of the first man as "having received grace from without, and having lost it."[2] That which guided him was an illumination from that exhaustless fountain, which has its centre in Him before whom the angels hide their faces, and "who dwelleth in the light which nothing can approach unto."[3]

The guiding light then of original humanity, was not merely that perfection of natural understanding which resulted from the happy constitution of man's inherent powers, but a special and supernatural indwelling of the great Author of all knowledge. And as this results from the general testimonies of Scripture respecting that sole source of wisdom who dwells above, so it is confirmed by what is taught respecting the subsequent gifts bestowed upon mankind. For even the Heathen must have derived their remaining light of conscience, however darkened and confused, from Him who is "the true light which lighteth every man."[4] And it is the peculiar blessing of Christians, that by their union with Christ they may renew that connexion with God which Adam lost. For it was through the intervention of the Word, or Eternal Son, that man was originally created in the image of his Maker. For it was by him that "the worlds

[1] *De Gen. Hom.* xv. [2] *Or. II. c. Arian.* 68, and *Or. III.* 38.
[3] *φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον.* The force of the term is hardly given by "no *man* can approach unto."—1 Tim. vi. 16. [4] John i. 9.

were made." He was that Word or Wisdom, "whose delights were with the sons of men."[1] Especially does St. John tell us, that it was through Him that the Light or guidance of man was given.

Now, it is set forth in numerous places of Holy Writ, that the peculiar purpose of that gift of the Holy Ghost, which is bestowed in the Gospel, is that through union with the Son of God, we may regain the perfect image of the Creator. Christ "became the head[2] of man's race," says St. Irenæus, "that in Him we might recover the likeness of God, which in Adam we had lost." Inasmuch, then, as the gift of union with Christ, which is bestowed by the Holy Ghost, is plainly a supernatural blessing, and that through it we are to recover that likeness to God which man originally possessed, it follows that the likeness of God must have been some Divine presence, superadded to primitive nature. This presence of the superior Being was what gave perfection to that likeness of God, in which man was created. Now, that what is to be enjoyed in the Gospel is a likeness to Christ, and thus to God, is a truth which had been ever pressing upon the minds of the Apostles, from the time that our Lord vouchsafed that wondrous declaration, "The glory, which Thou gavest Me, have I given them." Hence St. Paul declares it the vocation of Christians, that whom God "did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son."[3] Hence he tells the Corinthians that "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we must also bear the image of the heavenly."[4] And again he says, that Christians "have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."[5] And "we all reflecting[6] like a glass the glory of

[1] Proverbs viii. 31.

[2] "Recapitulavit." Ἀνακεφαλαιόω was, no doubt, the original word of St. Irenæus—iii. 18, 1, p. 209.

[3] Romans viii. 29.

[4] 1 Corinthians xv. 49.

[5] Colossians iii. 10. See also Ephesians iv. 22, 23; 1 John iii. 2; 2 Corinthians iv. 4.

[6] Vide Olshausen on 2 Corinthians iii. 18.

the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." All these passages show that the gift of the gospel is that "knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," which had originally, though as the Apostle implies in inferior measure, been designed for the family of man. When the Eternal Word created the first man in God's image, He bestowed the beginning of this gift; its fulness was vouchsafed when He gave Himself to be the second man in the flesh.

And this may lead us to some further appreciation of what has been already stated, that birth-sin does not lie in the depravation of those individual principles of right and wrong which constitute the witness of our conscience, but in the disorder and disarrangement which our being, regarded as a whole, has derived from sin. This is "the fault and corruption" of every man's nature. For the very cause of this disorder is the withdrawal, or at least the obscuration of that divine light,[1] by which man was originally guided. And thence arises the turmoil and confusion of clamorous appetites warring against the law of our mind, and bringing us into captivity to the law of sin, which is in our members. We must be careful indeed not to limit this rebellion of the inferior nature to that material being, which has been united in our constitution to an intelligent soul. This is the heresy of Manes, which is for ever appearing under various forms, and which merges the deformity of sin in the impotence of matter. The inheritance of man's sin extends both to his body and his mind. It follows from the lack of that divine light which man lost through sin, and which is not less needful for the guidance of his intellect, than for the subjugation of his material clay. So that man's corruption[2] consists first, in the deprivation of the divine guidance

[1] "Vita Deus animæ est, ipsa corporis . . . noluit anima regi a Deo, non queat regere corpus."—*S. Bernard.*

[2] "If we speak of original sin *formally*, it is the privation of those excellent gifts of divine grace, enabling us to know, love, fear, serve, honour, and trust in God, and to do the things He delighteth in, which Adam had

which he has rejected, for "the light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not;" and, secondly, in the consequent rebellion of the lower principles of his body and his soul. Now, that this is the real nature of man's sinfulness is evidenced by the fact that Christ Our Lord took our common nature; and it may also be shown to be most accordant with those principles of justice which the Most High has sanctioned in Holy Scripture. That Christ should have taken man's nature, shows that its corruption was not in such wise inherent in its existence, that to assume the nature was to adopt the sin. On this subject we may quote a remarkable admission in Baur's reply to Möhler's work on Symbolism. Certain expressions of some of the German Reformers tend, according to Möhler, to the Manichæan heresy; because, by making man's hereditary sin a *positive* part of his constitution, they exempt man himself, regarded as a whole, from its guilt, and refer it back in reality to the being by whom this part of his constitution was created. Baur replies, that whatever may be alleged against the expressions in question, such could not have been their intention, because the German Reformers affirm Christ to have become by Incarnation consubstantial with mankind. "That Christ's manhood was consubstantial with the nature even of fallen man, was never denied by the Protestants; all that was affirmed was, that He was free from original sin. But had the true meaning of the Protestant teaching respecting original sin been, as Möhler supposes, to reduce man to the condition of a beast, it would have been impossible that Christ should have been consubstantial with mankind." [1] Thus, then, are we led to the conclusion, that original sin arises from the absence of that guiding light, the lack of

and lost. If *materially*, it is that habitual inclination that is found in men averse from God, carrying them to the love and desire of finite things more than of God, and this also is properly sin, making guilty of condemnation the nature and person in which it is found. This habitual inclination to desire finite things inordinately is named concupiscence."—*Field on the Church*, Appendix to Book iii. chap. v.

[1] Baur's *Gegensatz*, &c., p. 78.

which was followed by general confusion in man's inner nature. By this means was a door opened to that hostile power of evil, which had no place in man's original being. And though it is not for us to explain the principle of God's decisions, yet it may be observed, that to represent original sin as resulting from the withdrawal of a divine light, and as a consequent transmitted disorganization of the lower appetites and powers, consists well with St. Paul's statement respecting the dealings of the Almighty. He "endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction." Now, however difficult it may be for us to discern the nature of man's trial, it will doubtless appear at last that every one is tried and judged according to his opportunities. But that it should have pleased God to withdraw the specific gift of guidance, which was originally conferred upon Adam, is in itself not more inconsistent with the principles of justice than the removal of any other endowment which man could not challenge as a right, though it had been mercifully bestowed upon him. All that is necessary is, that we should not so wholly identify the sinfulness of man with that loss of guidance on which it followed, as to destroy the individual responsibility of Adam's children. And one circumstance, which must, of course, greatly affect this whole question, is the perfect parallel which exists between the first man and the second—between the type and the antitype—him in whom humanity fell, and Him in whom it rose again; between Adam, in whom a divine spirit was united only for a season to our mortal being, and Christ, in whom the same spirit dwelt permanently and without measure. "For if through the offence of one, many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one *man* Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."

For that Adam should be the type and head of man's race, leads us to appreciate the character which was assumed by that new head of our race, Christ Jesus. The fact, however it be accounted for, that man's race has been dealt with as an organic

whole,[1] which was represented by the one, makes it more natural that it should be in like manner associated with the other. For it may be shown that the peculiar constitution of nature, which existed in Adam, and whereby he was especially qualified to be the representative of his race, re-appeared for the first time, but in a far higher measure, in the second Adam, Jesus Christ. So that one was fitted by His nature for that office, which the other had, in fact, discharged. For what was His conception in the Virgin's womb, save a taking of the original elements of our being, which He moulded into a perfect manhood, through the power of the Holy Ghost? For the Word was made flesh; He clothed Himself in man's whole nature; He took the very same composition of parts, which remained to Adam after the likeness of God was lost. "Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself took part of the same." And this He did, not by the creation of materials which did not before exist; the materials were drawn from that stock for which the benefit was designed. He was "made of a woman." The materials, therefore, which were employed were weak and disorganized, because they were taken of one who naturally was heir to Adam's defects.[2] But then He

[1] On this subject the following passage occurs in the able work of Günther [*Vorschule zur Speculativen Theologie*:]—"The *Idea* of man, as originally conceived in the mind of the Creator, is not merely that of an individual or person, but at the same time that of a race. This, when properly understood, does not imply merely a collective, but an *organic* being. By this Idea, as being His original thought, God's acts of creation for the support of the race are directed. If therefore the first man, as the representative of the race because its father, broke off the connection between his Spirit and the Godhead, the Creative Impulse on the part of God could not renew that connection and take away that breach, which he had allowed to be produced in the case of the solitary first man. And why could it not? Because, by such an act of alteration and renewal, God would have been at variance with Himself, by reason of that *Idea* which He had originally formed of mankind as a race."—*Letter* 7, vol. ii. p. 161.

[2] If the Blessed Virgin had not been an inheritor of our common nature, she would have been less suitable for that service which it was her privilege to discharge. "Quod (de B. Virgine) assumpsit, id profecto aut suscipiendum mundavit, aut suscipiendo mundavit."—*S. Aug. de Pecc. Meritis*,

who took them was the Word of God. Into those weak and poor elements of our nature, there flowed the very might, wisdom, and purity of Deity itself. Thus was their weakness from the first corrected: from the first moment that His nature existed, its disorder was counteracted by the perfect order and harmony of God's spirit, and though made of a woman, He was made without sin. Therefore, when the tempter assailed Him, he did it not, as Damascene remarks, through the medium of His inward thoughts, but, as in Adam's case, by external aggression.[1] For in His constitution there were the elements of Adam's being, together with the perfect presence of that Wisdom of God, which had vouchsafed its influence as an indwelling gift to our first parent. So exactly did the constitution of the one accord with the constitution of the other. "For when the Son of God was made man, He took the ancient mould upon Himself."[2] For He had Himself, as Methodius observes, been the very model upon which it had been fashioned. For "God made man after the pattern of His image, Jesus Christ."[3] In Adam was humanity, and the presence of the Word superadded as a guiding light. In Christ was God the Word by personal presence, who for our sakes had added to Himself human flesh. Thus is attained that perfection of man's nature which, in the case of our first parent, was only transiently set forth. For that perfection lay in the intercourse with God, which Adam so soon renounced. But in Christ is this intercourse restored permanently and in its completeness. So that so far as He is truly imitated, the greatest gift of primeval nature is given back. "Although we were made after God's image," says St. Athanasius, "and are called God's image and glory, yet we are not called so on our own account; but it is by reason of the

i. 24. The holiness, which is ascribed both by St. Austin. *De Nat. et Grat. c.* xxxvi., and by the English Church, to "St. Mary the Virgin," was not therefore the effect of natural constitution, but of divine grace.

[1] *De Fide Orthod.* iii. 20.

[2] S. Irenæus, iv. 33-4, p. 271.

[3] Method. *Symposium.*

true image and glory of God which dwelt in us, namely, His WORD, which afterwards for our sakes became flesh, that we have the gift of this appellation."[1] Thus, as Adam was a type of humanity in his constitution, so also is Christ. True it is, that men are not united to the second man by that actual paternity by which they are all bound to the first. But the pattern form is perfectly developed; it remains only to find some no less real means of union, whereby they may enjoy the blessing of this higher descent. For "the first man is of the earth, earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven." The first is the original form on which humanity was moulded, and with which all its inheritors have been connected by natural descent. The second is the pattern form on which it was remodelled, and which was designed as a principle of union to those who should be joined to it by grace. With Adam all men are actually connected, for they are born his children; and all men who will, may by the new birth of regeneration be united to Christ. "For the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."

Thus is that object attained for which man's heart had always longed—the union of our inferior with that superior nature, by which his weakness might be redressed, and its ignorance enlightened. And here it is impossible not to observe the contrast between that gift which was bestowed by the God of truth, and those idle dreams in which the vain imagination of men had embodied their hopes. If the gods, says Aristotle, take interest in human affairs, they may be expected to look with most satisfaction on what is most akin to their own nature.[2] On this principle have man's natural conceptions of Divine interference proceeded. Taking that notion which his corrupt heart suggested of the Deity, he has reasoned from it to the probable manifestations of Divine help. Hence with the Greeks,

[1] *Orat. III. contra Arian.* sec. 10. [2] *Eth. Nic.* x. 8.

in whom strength[1] and beauty were the idolized qualities of our nature, the manifestations of the Deity were

"Too fair to worship, too divine to love."

The favoured Æneas was "os humerosque Deo similis." On the other hand, the notions of immensity of power and stature which floated before the dreamy minds of the Orientals, when they thought of the Incarnation of God, are such as Southey delights to express, though they want the deep moral tone which is given to them by that truly Christian poet:—

"I take my grant, the Incarnate Power replies,
With his first step he measured o'er the earth,
The second spann'd the skies."

Or again,

"In form a fiery column did he tower,
Whose head above the highest height extended,
Whose base below the deepest depth descended."

Contrast these, then, with Him whose "visage was marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men."[2] The glory of His presence lies in the revelation of that image of God which addresses itself to our inner nature: "The new man is after God created in righteousness and true holiness."[3] Therefore, though no doubt the interior must have cast some beams of its lustre on the outer man—"the unpolluted temple of the mind"—yet it was no splendour of external features by which the Son of God revealed Himself: "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him."[4] He was in truth "the brightness of His" Father's "glory, and the express image of His person," but mortal eyes required to be purged before they could appreciate

[1] So in Habakkuk, the description of a lawless warrior is (in the Hebrew) one "to whom his might is his God," cap. i. v. 11; and in Job xii. 6 according to Gesenius), "he bears his God in his hand," *i.e.*, his sword is his God.

It would be unjust not to notice the remarkable exception afforded by Plato. "The temperate man," he says, "is dear to God, for he is like Him." "Likeness to God consists in justice, holiness, and prudence."—*Vide Petavius de Opificio Sex Dierum*, ii. 2, 10.

[2] Isaiah lii. 14. [3] Ephesians iv. 24. [4] Isaiah liii. 2.

the divine excellence. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." Thus was there exhibited a true Pattern for the children of men, in whom was set forth that gift, of which all may have participation. For here is restored the true constitution of our being, the man renewed takes the place of man fallen.[1]

And further, we see here the great evil of Idolatry, as being a perversion of the grand principle of man's being. For it is to lose sight of what is duly divine and noble, that original image of God, the traces whereof had not been altogether effaced from the consciences of mankind. For "He left not Himself without witness," not only in that "He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons," but also in that men's conscience bore witness, and their thoughts accused or excused one another.[2] Now, for this inward approach to that Word which was the true image of the Father, men substituted the worship of images made like to corruptible men, and to birds, and beasts, and creeping things. But what depraved their judgment was the corruption of their will. It was "because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge," that God gave them over to a reprobate mind.

And no less may be said of that more disguised idolatry of polished times, which gives to intellectual strength or beauty the worship which was once paid to physical powers. To search after God by the exertion of understanding—to realize Him by the powers of abstract meditation—to satisfy ourselves that we are secure of His favour, because we have on our side the witness of our private will, instead of seeking for union with that Pattern Man, whom He has set forth as the way, the truth, and the life—what is this but a more subtile idolatry than that of old? God's likeness must be first restored, before we can

[1] "Neque enim mole sed virtute magnus est Deus."—*S. Aug. Ep.* 137.
[2] Acts xiv. 17; Romans ii. 15.

truly draw near to our Creator. It lies not in strength of intellect, more than in strength of limb, but in that divine gift, which, having been forfeited by the first Adam, was more than given back by the second. We must draw near to God, therefore, "through that new and living way which He has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh." "For not by intervals of space," says St. Augustine, "but by likeness, do we draw near to God, and by unlikeness do we depart from Him."[1] And those who would seek Him otherwise, in truth "worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for evermore."

CHAPTER IV.

CHRIST, THE PATTERN MAN IN SYMPATHY.

It has been shown that the office of the Son of Man was to be the Pattern of our race. For this He was marked out by ancient prophecy; and as such He is described in later Scripture. Again, He has been shown to have been fitted for His office by the constitution of His nature. He vouchsafed actually to introduce Himself into the line of transmitted humanity, so as to gain a real relationship to all its inheritors; and the character in which this was effected corresponded so exactly with that original type in which our nature was moulded, as to make Him a new Head to mankind. Regarded according to His human nature, He was truly the second Adam; a fresh, but glorified specimen of that primitive type in which humanity was formed. One thing remains, before He is exhibited on the other and higher side of His being; it must be shown that the conditions of His earthly character were such that His sympathies were truly those which His office implied, and His nature warranted.

The present inquiry does not respect those single acts which Christ wrought for our benefit, especially that crowning act by

[1] *De Trin.* vii. 10.

which He paid the price of our redemption. For these, though wrought through the intervention of that nature which He took that He might be capable of suffering and death, were yet wrought by one who was truly God by unity of personal subsistence. And therefore His acts of mercy to mankind will be considered, when He has been set forth as "God over all, blessed for ever." For whatsoever He did was done by the same person —it was God who was born—His Virgin Mother was the Mother of God; it was God who was crucified—God who purchased His flock "with His own blood." "By the Lord of Glory, we must needs understand the whole person [1] of Christ, who, being Lord of Glory, was indeed crucified, but *not in that nature for which He is termed* the Lord of Glory." "Cyril contendeth, that whosoever will deny *very God* to have suffered death, doth forsake the faith. Which notwithstanding to hold were heresy, if the name of God in this assertion did not impart, as it doth, the person of Christ, who being verily God suffered death, but in the flesh, and not in that substance for which the name of God is given Him." [2]

The acts of Christ, then, as they were performed by the co-operation, or at least association of His two natures, do not come, except by way of illustration, into our present inquiry, which concerns His manhood considered in itself. What we are examining is, that power of *doing* or *suffering*, by which His manhood contributed to the acts or passions of that Divine Person who was manifest in the flesh. What is to be shown is, first, that there was a true human character in Christ our Master; and secondly, that His manner of participating in it, corresponded with that pattern or representative function which it was His pleasure to discharge. And this must be shown both

[1] All properties or attributes, which belong either to the human or divine nature, may be predicated *in the concrete* of Christ, both God and Man; but those which belong to the one nature cannot be predicated *in the abstract* of the other.

[2] *Eccles. Polity*, v. 53; vid. *Vigilius c. Eutych.* iv. 5.

as respects the body of the Son of Man, and as respects His mind.

I. That there was a true human character in Our Lord's body is too obvious to require proof; since Scripture shows us that it was, in fact, subjected to hunger, pain, weariness, and death. We have evidence that food sustained, and sleep refreshed it. As in Our Lord's immaterial nature, what needs most attention is, to discern that what is human was not wholly effaced by personal union with Deity; so since Our Lord's body was obviously consubstantial with ours, our principal aim in considering it must be to discern the consequences of that Godhead by which it was never forsaken. For even the earthly body which was taken by Christ Our Lord in the Virgin's womb, afforded indications of His peculiar character. It was not, so far as we read, assaulted by sickness; man's ancient mastery over the brute creation appears to have been given back; it derived such a principle of vitality from union with Godhead, that not only was its own subjection to death a voluntary act, but it was a source of life and health to others. These things pertained to Our Lord's human body, by reason of that peculiar constitution of nature which fitted Him to be the Head and Pattern of man's race.

That Our Lord would actually suffer under human sickness, might perhaps be expected from St. Matthew's words: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."[1] That no such event is recorded has been made a ground for questioning the vicarious nature of those acts by which He remedied the sins of men as well as their sorrows. For the two benefits are introduced together in the words of Isaiah[2] to which St. Matthew refers; and St. Peter speaks of Christ as bearing "our sins,"[3] as St. Matthew of His bearing our sicknesses. If the second, it is said, implies only that sickness was cured, the first need not imply any real sacrifice of atonement. Hence it is argued that there was no mystery in Our Lord's sufferings, nor any relation

[1] St. Matt. viii. 17. [2] Isaiah liii. 4, 5. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 24.

between us and Him, except that between a benefactor and those who profit by His services. To avoid so monstrous a conclusion, we seek some real mode in which Christ can be said to have borne our sicknesses. And what is commonly suggested is, that His perfect sympathy with man's nature enabled Him to participate perfectly in all its griefs. This is to transfer Our Lord's participation in mortal ills from His body to His soul. But that this explanation may be complete, we must show that Our Lord's actual immunity (so far as we read) from sickness was compensated for in some other manner; so that any defalcation in His acquaintance with human sufferings on the side of the body, was made up by that greater fulness with which the gift of sympathy possessed His mind. It is commonly said, that whatever be men's kindness of disposition, they cannot realize bodily pain unless they have experienced it. Was it so with Christ? Would He have entered more fully into human sickness if He had Himself made trial of its bitterness? The reason why such a circumstance would not have enhanced His sympathy is, that it is excluded by that very condition from which His sympathy is derived. For His sympathy resulted from His being the Pattern Man, the very representative of our common being, who was able to enter into all its wants, and had fellow-feeling with all its sorrows. This subject shall be taken up again, when we have spoken of the mental characteristics of the Son of Man: at present His body only is spoken of. Now, by virtue of that Headship which made Him the representative of mankind, it belonged to His body to exhibit whatever pertained to man's race at large, and constituted its generic qualifications. Therefore, He submitted to fear, because it belongs to humanity; to pain, because none escape it; to death, because it is appointed for all. But when He tasted "death for all men," it was not necessary that He should make trial of every kind of death by which the tribes of man return to the dust. These are the accidental circumstances of that event whose common elements only He came to share. And so may it be said respecting sicknesses,

which are all summed up in death as their common end. But their individual conditions arise commonly from intemperance, or from some original defect in the attempering of the elements of our being. These causes could not exist in Him, who was the Head and type of Man's nature.[1] For when He introduced Himself into the series of human being, He assumed that perfect form of manhood which was free from the varieties of individual eccentricity. This was what qualified Him for relationship to collective humanity. So that the very circumstances which rendered His sympathy so perfect, precluded participation in the accidental particulars of human sicknesses. Yet He bore their collective burthen when He put on that earthly body of whose nature they are the individual developments. And we know not how far He may have tasted all their bitterness in that season of temptation in which He was proof against the solicitations of the body, as well as against the Seducer of the Mind:

> "A thousand ways frail mortals lead
> To the cold tomb, and dreadful all to tread;
> But dreadful most, when by a slow decay,
> Pale hunger wastes the manly strength away."

And finally, He sustained them all, not only by His inward sympathy with His brethren, but in that actual death wherein He summed up all the pains and evils which afflict humanity at large. Unless this fact be discerned, we form but an imperfect estimate of the sufferings of Him who truly sustained the weight of afflicted humanity. He bore that collective load which none but the God-man could undergo, and in His single burthen supported all the woes of His fellows.

Again, the nature of the Pattern Type of manhood is indicated by some occasional allusions to Our Lord's intercourse with the

[1] "Illos defectus Christus assumere debuit, qui consequuntur ex peccato communi totius naturæ.—Quidam autem defectus sunt, qui non consequuntur communiter totam humanam naturam, propter peccatum primi Parentis, sed causantur in aliquibus hominibus.—Qui quidem defectus quandoque causantur ex culpa hominis, puta ex inordinato victu; quandoque autem ex defectu virtutis formativæ. Quorum neutrum convenit Christo."—*Summa Theol.* iii, 14, 4.

inferior creatures. A supremacy over them had been the result of Adam's likeness to their Creator. The perfect restoration of this likeness in the Son of Man must have given Him that complete control which humanity in general is not so far fallen as altogether to have lost. Such may perhaps have been one lesson which the Gadarenes were intended to learn from the miracle of the swine. And so much seems indicated to us, when we read that Our Lord was "with the wild beasts,"[1] in that solitary region where He triumphed[2] over the foe, by whom Adam, in presence of the same spectators, had been worsted.

Again, That the earthly body of Our Lord was the medium through which life and health was conveyed to other bodies, is expressly recorded in Holy Writ. It is not our purpose to speak of the acts of healing which were thus wrought, because His Divine mind and will must not be excluded from participation in the miracles of which His body was the medium. Yet, when we consider the nature of His body in itself, when we inquire whether the conditions of its existence answer to the character of Him who assumed it, we see peculiar reasons why virtue should flow, as we are assured it did,[3] out of this body into the bodies of others. Something of the same kind is said to have happened occasionally, and by God's[4] peculiar appointment, in the case of others: in the case of Christ, no such external actor is referred to, as though the effect was a natural consequence of His character.[5] Now, since Christ, as the second Adam, is that seed of life through whom the "spiritual body"[6] is to be quickened at the last day, that

[1] St. Mark i. 13.

[2] Γέγονε γὰρ ἄνθρωπος, ἵνα τὸ νικηθὲν νικήσῃ.—Damasc. *De Fide Orth.* iii. 18.

[3] St. Mark v. 30.

[4] Acts xix. 11, 12.

[5] It is impossible not to be struck by the contrast which, in this particular, is presented by the Apostles and Prophets to the Son of Man; the conferring of a derived life seemed to task their powers to the utmost, while this gift flowed forth at a word or a touch, from His majestic manhood. The opposition is strikingly brought out on the day when the Church reads a miracle of Elisha, and another of Christ, for the two Morning Lessons [May 11—2 Kings iv; St. Matthew ix.].

[6] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

"virtue should go out of Him"[1] when He was upon earth, is nowise inconsistent with what Scripture leads us to expect. For it speaks of some mysterious change as incident to the bodies of men, and of His body as the type of their new creation. He "shall change our vile body, that it may be like unto His glorious body."[2] Whether the influence exerted when He was upon earth were material or immaterial, it is needless to ask. The miracle must appear equally great to those who believe the statement of the Apostle, that the virtue which proceeded from Christ "healed them all." And that "the whole multitude sought to touch Him," shows that His body was the instrument through which the gift was bestowed. Bishop Hampden thinks it necessary to offer a sort of apology for Our Lord's statement, that "virtue had gone out of Him," as being "a mode of speaking characteristic of the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine influence, as of something passing from one body to another."[3] But the words of Him who spake as never man spake, could not be infected by human errors. Now, without stating the manner in which virtue proceeded from His man's body, Our Lord reveals, as a fact, that it was the medium through which virtue was bestowed. He sets it forth as possessed of an instrumental efficacy in that work of renovating the race of man, which extends to the restoration of their bodies as well as the renewal of their souls.[4]

Lastly: That Our Lord's body has some especial effect in this work of regeneration, follows from the peculiar attribute of an innate life, with which itself is declared to have been invested. This rendered it the type and pattern of innumerable partakers in Adam's race, of whom its resurrection is declared to be the first fruits. For the oneness with Godhead which it possessed

[1] St. Luke vi. 19. [2] Philip. iii. 21.

[3] *Bamp. Lect.* vii. p. 316.

[4] "Since the life-giving Word of God dwelt in the flesh, He transformed it into that excellence which belongs to Himself, *i.e.* into Life, and by His intimate and unspeakable union with it, He rendered it life-giving as He is Himself."—*S. Cyr. Alex.* iv. 354.

by nature, corrected that tendency to decay which belonged to all other descendants of Adam. Life natural would have been maintained in our first parents by that tree of life, which to eat was to "live for ever."[1] Therefore, death temporal would not have befallen them, save as the effect of that death spiritual, which was the result of sin. And so in Christ, who was Himself the very source of life[2] by virtue of His Godhead, this Divine influence made it impossible that His body should decay. Therefore, when His body entered the mansions of death, "it was not possible that He should be holden of it."[3] The spiritual immutability, which belonged to Him by nature, was a perpetual antidote to His body's death. So that when this event befell Him, it was by His own consent: "No man taketh My life from Me, but I lay it down of Myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."[4] All these things show that Christ's body is the Type and Pattern of those innumerable frames with whom He consented to become consubstantial both in body and soul; "for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."[5]

II. That which has been proved respecting the body of Christ, is not less true respecting the faculties of His mind. In this respect also was He in character, not less than in nature and by office, the Pattern of mankind. There are two main parts of man's mental constitution—the will and the understanding. Each of these was assumed by Christ according to the fulness of man's being; and in respect of each, it may be shown that the character under which He displayed it, expressed the perfect type of the nature which He had adopted.

An inquiry into our Lord's human will is facilitated by the consideration that we are ourselves conscious of a multiform action in this part of our nature. Besides the "video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor" of the heathen, we have St. Paul's

[1] Genesis iii. 22; vid. S. Aug. *De Pecc. Mor.* i. 3, *De Civ. Dei*, xiii. 23.
[2] St. John v. 26.
[3] Acts ii. 24.
[4] St. John x. 18.
[5] 1 Cor. xv. 21.

declaration, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind." Thus are we conscious of being approached on two sides, if we may express a mental process physically; we can fancy opposing powers to hold one another in such exact counterpoise, that without a self-determining will, there would be no means of settling the preponderancy. These thoughts prepare us for the declaration of Scripture, that Our Lord "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."[1] The perfection of His man's nature implies the complete development both of body and mind, so far as they were consistent with personal union with the nature of God. Not only was He subject to those sensations which approach us through the body —hunger, thirst, weariness, faintness, fear—but likewise to those which especially assault the mind: "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." And to His disciples He says in general, "Ye are they that have continued with Me in My temptations." Further, we have a peculiar means of discerning what our Lord endured on the human side of His character, by observing what is said of those who typified Him. For it was of Christ, as a man, that their lives were an acted prophecy. David was a type of his great descendant, because Christ's humanity was exalted to royal honour. For the Incarnation was as great a debasement of Divine as it was an exaltation of human nature; and it must have been in reference therefore to the last, that the Psalmist expressed himself: "The Lord said unto My Lord, Sit thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." The trials, therefore, of Our Lord, considered according to His earthly nature, are set forth in the twenty-second Psalm: "O go not from Me, for trouble is hard at hand, and there is none to help Me." And when all the Disciples forsook Him and fled, we see how "they of Mine acquaintance were afraid of Me, and they that did see Me without, conveyed themselves from Me."

[1] Hebrews iv. 15.

Thus truly did Our Lord make trial of those assaults to which man's will is incident; and especially in that last great act of His earthly course, whereby He made atonement for the sins of men. For then it was that He exclaimed: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" This burthen of deprivation He endured through His man's nature, when, in some manner to us unknown, He withdrew from it for a time the succours of Deity. It may be that it was impossible that perfect sympathy for man's weakness should exist, where man's temptations had not been actually undergone. For "we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities;" and "in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted."[1] Thus completely, as regards the province of the will, did Our Lord submit to the conditions of Humanity. But wherein did He exhibit Himself as the Pattern Man of the race? Because in Him, first of all descendants of Adam, was *will* exhibited in that complete freedom, which was its normal condition and perfect state. By will is meant the power of choice or of refusal. Its existence, therefore, implies freedom from external constraint. But it is compatible with the influence of inward motives, which cannot fail to appeal to it, according to their proper powers of attraction. To suppose, indeed, that motives possess such irresistible power, that it is impossible for *will* to offer resistance, is practically to deny its reality, and thus to exonerate its possessors from responsibility. But though *will* must be supposed to be so far free, that men are accountable for their actions, yet it has never been perfectly free in any of the fallen descendants of Adam. This perfect liberty is gained only in Him, in whom the unlimited presence of God's Spirit[2] supplied the place of that Divine guidance which had been given to our first parent; and counteracted the tendency to concupiscence which had been

[1] Hebrews iv. 15, and ii. 18.

[2] "Inclinationem solus ille immutare potest, qui virtutem volendi creaturæ contulit."—*Summa* i. Q. 106, 2.

transmitted to his progeny. Thus did the Son of Man allay the inner storm of human passion, saying, "Peace, be still." And thus did He set forth in its perfection that state of freedom for which man was originally designed. This is the gift which, by union with Him, He bestows upon His brethren. The liberty, sought by worldly men in exemption from external restraints, can be realized only by union with that Pattern Man, who attained the true freedom. The conformity of man's will to the will of Him, in whose pattern man was moulded, is that normal state of tranquillity and happiness after which unregenerate humanity is vainly yearning. For God's "service is perfect freedom," and "if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

We approach a more difficult subject, when we speak of Our Lord's participation in human ignorance. But as He was perfect man, He must have made acquaintance not only with the infirmities of our will, but with the weakness of our understanding. This participation, however, could not have deprived Godhead of that infinite knowledge,[1] which everywhere and always is its inalienable portion. Yet, since knowledge and ignorance are incompatible, we understand not how in the same person they could dwell together. Conflicting impulses may strive in the same mind, but it is the very character of knowledge, that by its approach, ignorance is banished. How then could there be ignorance in that human mind, which was personally united to Omniscience

There are not wanting expressions in the writings of the earlier Fathers, which would imply that a belief of the actual ignorance of Our Lord, regarded as man, if not positively received, was yet not always distinctly rejected. Thus, St. Athanasius tells us, that Our Lord "shows that He knows the end of all things as the Word, but as man is ignorant of it. For it belongs to man to be ignorant, especially of such things as these. So that this expression arises from His goodness towards man's nature, inasmuch as becoming man He is not ashamed, so far as His ignorant flesh

[1] Fulgentius ad Tras. i. 8, *Bib. Pat.* ix. 44.

goes, to say, 'I know not.'"[1] And again, "We who reverence Christ are assured that He did not say He was ignorant in that He was the Word, for in that relation He knew well; but showing His human nature, because it belongs to humanity to be ignorant, and He had put on ignorant flesh—speaking in reference to this He said, that as a man, He was ignorant."[2] A similar statement occurs in St. Ambrose, in reference to Our Lord's increase in wisdom. "There was increase," he says, "of age, and increase of wisdom, but it was of human wisdom." "If He advanced as a man in age, He must have advanced as a man in wisdom; the advance in wisdom must have been proportionate to that in perception, from which it is derived."[3] "And in like manner," says St. Irenæus, "the Son of God assigned a knowledge of the day and hour of the Day of Judgment to the Father only, saying plainly, 'of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the Son, but the Father.'"[4]

On a closer examination, however, these passages—at least those in both the later writers—appear to mean nothing but that *by virtue of His Humanity*, Our Lord was not conversant with that which, as matter-of-fact, was never hidden even from His human mind. The expressions of St. Athanasius allow ignorance in Christ, not so much in that He was a man, but in so far as knowledge came through His manhood. When he proceeds to treat of our Lord's increase in knowledge, though he allows His Humanity to have admitted of accessions, yet he explains it mainly by "an inward revelation or unveiling of the Deity to those who beheld Him."[5] And St. Ambrose declares still more positively his dissent from those (of whom he says there were many) "who say confidently that Our Lord could not be ignorant so far as His Deity was concerned, but that so far as

[1] *Orat. III. c. Arian.* xliii. vol. i. p. 593.
[2] *Orat. III. c. Arian.* xlv. vol. i. p. 594.
[3] *De Incarnatione*, vii. sec. 72, vol. ii. p. 720.
[4] St. Mark xiii. 32. Vide Iren. II. xxviii. 6, p. 158.
[5] He speaks of *ἡ φανέρωσις τῆς θεότητος τοῖς ὁρῶσιν. ὅσῳ δὲ ἡ θεότης ἀπεκαλύπτετο, κ.τ.λ.*—*Orat. III. contra Arian.* 52, vol. i. p. 601.

He shared our nature, He was ignorant before His crucifixion." "He took our affections," replies St. Ambrose, "that He might speak of Himself as sharing in our ignorance; He was not positively ignorant."[1] And the same seems to have been the feeling of St. Ambrose's greater disciple: "I would by no means suppose," says St. Augustine, "that there was the ignorance of infancy in that infant, in whom the Word was made flesh to dwell in us, nor would I attribute the weakness of the mind of children to the childhood of Christ."[2] And the same thing was still more strongly stated by St. John Damascene, when the Nestorian controversy had opened men's eyes to the possible consequences of the opposite alternative: "Those who maintain that Christ advanced in wisdom and grace, as though there was a positive addition of them, cannot maintain the conjunction between Godhead and His flesh to have commenced from its first existence, and therefore do not really hold the hypostatical union, but, inclining to the teaching of the vain Nestorius, they are deceived by the notion of a mere union of relations, and a bare indwelling." "For if the flesh was truly united to God the Word from its first origin, or rather if it had its origin in Him, and belonged to the same person with Him, how could it but be filled full with all knowledge and grace?"[3] And this, accordingly, has since been the received opinion in the Church. "As there was no sinful concupiscence in Christ through the fulness of grace, so through the perfection of wisdom, which was in Him, was there no ignorance." "For the nature which Christ assumed may be considered in two ways: one, as it is in itself, and in this respect it is ignorant and slavish —for man is His Maker's servant, and has no knowledge of the future;—the other, as it is united to the person of Him who, as St. John witnesses, was full of grace and truth."[4]

[1] "Nostrum adsumsit affectum, ut nostra ignoratione nescire se diceret, non quia aliquid ipse nesciret."—*S. Ambrose de Fide*, v. 18, sec. 221, 222, vol. ii. p. 592.

[2] *De Pecc. Mor.* ii. sec. 48, vol. x. p. 65.

[3] *De Fide Orthodox.* iii. 22, vol. i. p. 246.

[4] *Summa Theologiæ*, iii. xv. 3.

This statement of the Apostle is the more important, since it indicates the condition of Our Lord's being, even when He was manifest among men. The assertion that in Him "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,"[1] may be assigned to the period since the Godhead has dwelt in His glorified body. But St. John's words refer to what the disciples "beheld."[2] And they speak of Him as having upon earth that fulness of truth, which excludes ignorance.

And, therefore, since it would be impious to suppose that Our Lord had pretended an ignorance which He did not experience, we are led to the conclusion, that what He partook, as man, was not actual ignorance, but such deficiency in the means of arriving at truth, as belongs to mankind. Without asserting that the man Christ Jesus was ignorant, it may be said that He was ignorant, as man, of that which by His other nature was known to Him. His growth then was no delusion, but a real one; but the advance was in those means of intercourse by which the human mind communicates with the external world. He made trial of those channels of communication whereby the children of men are furnished with knowledge; He tested their uncertainty; He is able to pity those who are in like manner "compassed with infirmity." And so much seems distinctly asserted in that remarkable text, which tells us that "though He were a Son, yet *learned* He obedience by the things which He suffered."[3] Learning is plainly relevant to knowledge, and the especial difficulties which are incident to man may, for what we know, have been inappreciable, save by experience.[4] Therefore, He who was

[1] Col. ii. 3, 9. It would be hardly safe to refer to a passage, in which the text is so uncertain, if the same truth were not expressed in 1 Cor. i. 24.

[2] St. John i. 14.

[3] Hebrews v. 8.

[4] This appears to be the meaning of Aquinas, who, while denying that Christ could be said, even as man, to be positively ignorant, admits, as Le Grand expresses it, "quod multa jam sibi per scientiam infusam cognita, rursus novo modo, nempe experiendo, secundum varia ætatis suæ incrementa, didicerit."—Le Grand, *De Incarnatione*, diss. ix. cap. ii.

St. Thomas's words are: "Quod scientia Christi profecit secundum experientiam."—iii. 12, 2.

above the Angels, even as man, in His knowledge itself, consented to stoop below them in His manner of acquiring it. Not of course that His human soul can be partaker in itself of that Omniscience which belongs only to the Godhead. Of this Christ partakes in that He is God; but in that He is man, He can receive it only so far as His human nature is its fit recipient. His knowledge, says St. Thomas, extends "to all things which are in the power of a creature."[1] And this, according to Bishop Bull,[2] is the reason why St. Irenæus supposes Our Lord, as man, to have been ignorant of the Day of Judgment: "The Divine Wisdom produced its impression on Our Lord's human soul according to the occasion, and therefore there is no absurdity in supposing that Our Lord, during the time of His mission on earth, when such knowledge was needless for Him, was ignorant of the Day of Judgment."[3]

Now, by what means Our Lord should on the one hand have partaken at once of all creaturely knowledge, and, on the other, have trodden the tedious path of observation and inference, is beyond our comprehension. Not but that we can discern how a thing which is already known can be subsequently demonstrated. A man might determine, by admeasurement of parts, that the square of the hypothenuse was equal in area to the squares of the sides, and yet afterwards come to the same conclusion by reasoning. But in Our Lord there is something far beyond this: for every step which He gained by those means which acquaint us with the external world, must have been long before familiar to Him by way of intuition. But as He saw by outward light, as well as by the inward glory of the Godhead, and was sustained by food as well as by Omnipotence, so He condescended to reason on things outward, as well as to guide Himself by inward inspiration. Therefore, St. Augustine refers the statement,

[1] *Summa Theolog.* iii. x. 3.

[2] Massuet, in his preface to St. Irenæus, p. cxxxiii, asserts that Our Lord's expressions are only a species of hypothesis—that He professes to have no knowledge by Himself, but only as derived from the Godhead.

[3] *Defensio Fidei Nic.* ii. 5, sec. 8, p. 82.

that "the riches of Damascus shall be taken before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My Father and My Mother,"[1] to the offering, by the Magi, of the wealth of the East to our infant Lord. The two kinds of knowledge are brought together when Our Lord "lifted up His eyes, and saw Nathanael coming to Him," yet told him afterwards that "before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee."[2]

The increase then of Our Lord's "wisdom" was but the further development of those human powers, which are the means whereby we acquire knowledge. There may probably have been stages in their growth, and His entrance into the Temple in His twelfth year may have been a crisis in the capacity which was gained by His human faculties. They may then have so far opened, as to correspond to the largeness of those truths, which by direct intuition had already flowed into His mind. And if these statements seem to border on a contradiction, let it be remembered how often we ourselves can scarcely tell whether we know a thing or are ignorant of it; what has been told may be stored up in our mind and forgotten, till some new occasion calls it to light. Much of our knowledge consists of deductions from principles, which we either possess by the constitution of our nature, or have received so early, that we never noted their approach; and yet these things, which we learn afterwards to be conclusions furnished from within ourselves, address themselves to us at first as unexpected communications. Why do we allow things, save from discerning them to be true? How do we know them to be true, save that the elements of judgment are laid up within us? Whence were these originally derived? Such thoughts may prepare us for receiving what is stated concerning Our Lord with the less difficulty. He truly "increased in wisdom as in stature;" and yet, looked at according to the actual attainments of His mind, He was full of truth.

[1] Isaiah viii. 4. [2] John i. 47, 48.

So much respecting Our Lord's actual participation in the infirmities of man's understanding. Further, it was in Him that the understanding as well as the will of man attained its perfection. For man's reason cannot attain its full proportions, till it is shaped according to that primitive type in which it originated. Now, the excellence of its normal state lay in that complete reflection of God's image, the very condition of which was uninterrupted intercourse with the Creator. For "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all."[1] By being a fit subject for the reception of God's glory, was man distinguished from the beasts of the field. But by seeking after knowledge in his own way, he lost that true knowledge which cometh from God only. He forget that "the knowledge of The Holy is understanding."[2] Thus was man's understanding obscured, till "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness," gave back "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[3] In Him was the understanding of man restored to its perfect state, because in Him intercourse with God was perfectly re-opened. He became "the way," and "the truth." In those who are conformed to His likeness, understanding regains its proper rights, and attains that perfection, which, intercourse with God can alone produce. Thus does His character set forth in all respects the true type and pattern of man's nature, and by imitating Him, even His erring brethren may be seen to have "been with Jesus."

This view of Our Lord's character, as the true Pattern of Humanity, is further illustrated by two circumstances: First, the perfectness of His sympathy; secondly, the universality of His mind. And first of the sympathy of Christ.

It has been already mentioned, that to interpret the statements of Scripture by a reference to Our Lord's sympathy, is to transfer His participation in human griefs from His body to His mind. Not but that He made bodily trial of them, so far as consisted

[1] 1 John i. 5. [2] Proverbs ix. 10.
[3] 2 Corinthians iv. 6.

with that character of the perfect Pattern of Humanity in which He was manifested. And in the exercise of His mental sympathy we see in like manner its human origin, and yet that it was checked and controlled by those perfect conditions of will and understanding, which belonged to Him as the Son of man. His acts of mercy, when He was in the flesh, were performed in accordance with that law of human sympathy, which He took upon Him as part of the nature in which He became Incarnate. In His hands, so far as His Godhead was concerned, was lodged even at that season all power in heaven and earth. All sicknesses, which afflicted any of the sons of men, might have been healed by Him in a moment. All the pains of humanity might have been assuaged. But He exercised no such universal power of healing. His benefits were confined to those who came before Him in the flesh. These He cured through that divine power which was present with His manhood. And why were not others benefited by it? Because He allowed it to act according to that law of sympathy which belongs to man's nature, which time, place, presence affect, and which could not, regarded as a mere human feeling, be equally moved by the mere abstract knowledge of the existence of suffering. He gave scope, therefore, to the actings of this human principle, whether it led as by the grave of Lazarus to tears, or at the gates of Nain to pity. These were indications how truly He had adopted that common nature which He shared with His brethren. But then His sympathy was controlled and rendered stable by that guiding light which has been wanting both to the will and the understanding of man ever since the Fall. Without such guidance, sympathy is vague, unmeaning, or even mischievous. So that, missing the designed end of its operation, it falls back not seldom in the opposite extreme of misanthropy. Let it be given to the mere creature of human impulse to stay all sicknesses, or to feed thronging multitudes by miraculous support, and the consequence would be an inversion of the ordinary laws of God's providence, as mischievous for its immediate objects,

as for those who would rely on its prospective help. What would be the sure consequence, but the growth of those still greater moral evils, which are in a measure kept in control by physical wants? This tendency is seen in such alleged miracles of the middle ages, as are founded on an exaggerated application of what was permitted to the prophets of the Theocracy.

Now this unlimited power Our Lord possessed; but because it was under the control of that inward light which guided His spirit, it led in Him to no such results. His eye indeed saw man's miseries and pitied them. But His true perception of the real evils of man's nature, His estimate of the effect of guilt, His discernment that pain was an evil so much lighter than sin—this guided the general course of His sympathy. He gave therefore to His human nature what was its due. He wept when grief overflowed its banks—He succoured those whom the providence of the Great Disposer of all brought near Him. In His path through this world He scattered round Him His favours; but He allowed them not to interfere with His great mission for the common benefit of the race, which He had come to represent: He "did not commit Himself to any man, for He knew what was in man."

Again, the same principle is witnessed by the universality of our Master's earthly mind. When we turn to the greatest models of human genius, we find in their thoughts an all-adapting power, which makes them the interpreters of our common nature. They seem to be built upon the deepest basis of man's general being, because there is no feeling or condition of life, which does not find its reflection in their writings. Thus does human genius render its possessors a sort of type of their race, by concentrating in them those characteristics, which are dispersed through the ordinary specimens of mortality. Now, that which is given in its measure even to human genius, belonged in perfection only to Him who by nature was one with God. From Him all earthly excellence is derived; of Him it is typical. In Him that wisdom has its personal abode, which "in every people and nation

got a possession."[1] Therefore do His words contain such deep and unsearchable meaning, as shows them to be the sayings of One who discerned all the mysteries of man's nature. They are equally fitted, therefore, for every nation; they suit every climate, age, or condition. And again, in His character is such "largeness of heart," as exceeds the compass of mortal thought. Compare this perfect Pattern of our being with those various ministers who attended or preceded His approach, and how partial appear the several conditions which discriminate their nature, when compared with that all-embracing universality which is characteristic of His. This is why those many types which presaged His coming were unable to exhaust the infinite multifariousness of His character. For in them the choicest individual endowments were perfected by the gift of inspiration, but in Him humanity at large was elevated by the actual indwelling of God. That exaltation which was offered to man's whole race, through the power of the Holy Ghost—but of which the examples are only scattered, approximate, incomplete, according as men "are made partakers of the Divine image"—was at once exhibited without measure and in perfect type, in the great Pattern of our being. For in others we see the single colours of a reflected lustre; but in Him the concentrated glory of an original radiance is all that we can discern. How different, for example, was the practical earnestness of St. Peter and St. Paul, from the deep contemplativeness of the Beloved Apostle. How far removed are the plaintive breathings of Jeremiah, and the picturesque visions of Ezekiel, from the loftiness of the Evangelical Prophet. What a contrast is there between the fervid devoutness of the Psalmist, and the sententious majesty of his son! But who can venture to assign earthly limits to the universality of *His* character, of whom it is enough to declare that He "spake as never man spake"? For this reason should His simplest acts and words be treated with the reverence with which in ancient times were regarded the lineaments of His outward form. For everything is great

[1] Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 6.

which comes out of the depth of His unfathomable knowledge. Regarded only as a man, He is the Pattern whom the residue of His race are to adopt as their standard. For through Him is renewed that intercourse with God, which is our life. When we meditate upon His character, that door is opened which admits us to the Almighty. With what awe should we contemplate our near approach! "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."

CHAPTER V.

OUR LORD IS GOD THE WORD, VERY GOD OF VERY GOD.

Our Lord's Human character has been set forth in the preceding Chapters. It remains to show, that He who was thus manifest in the flesh was in truth "over all, God blessed for ever."[1]

Now, this statement implies so unutterable an amount of condescension, as to have been often received either with open dissent or with concealed dissatisfaction. And yet more frequently, perhaps, have men adopted the still less reasonable course of yielding it only a half credence, and thus have made their doubts a ground for questioning the opinions and practices, which, if the doctrine be admitted at all, are its necessary consequence. "How can I believe," said a politician of leading eminence in the last century to the late Mr. Wilberforce, when he opened his mind in the privacy of domestic converse, "that the Almighty Creator of all things should have become a wailing infant, and submitted to the weakness of our nature? Surely, it is utterly impossible." "I should be ready to enter into your feeling," was the reply, "if I viewed this truth in the abstract way that you do, and did not consider what difficulties there are in disbelieving it." Among these difficulties must be ranked, in the first place, the circum-

[1] Romans ix. 5.

stances of Our Lord's Human character, the preparation which had marked Him out as the Pattern Man, and the events in His life by which that character is indicated. How was it that a Jewish peasant, untaught even in the simple lore of Syrian literature,[1] should have conceived those truths, which have enlarged the sphere of man's knowledge, and made the one grand revolution in the history of his race? How could his designs have been developed, with a power which shook the mightiest kingdoms, overthrew all preceding forms either of faith or philosophy, and have finally cast into a new mould the most distant countries and generations of the earth? How was it that one who spoke no language, save a dialect of the barbarous East, could triumph over the pride of the Porch and the subtilty of the Academy? How came the might of thirty legions to yield to the staff and sling of the Son of David? What compelled men to admit the paradox of the fervid African, and allow the very strangeness of this truth to stamp it with the character of being Divine? "Crucifixus est Dei filius: non pudet, quia pudendum est; et mortuus est Dei filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est: et sepultus resurrexit: certum est, quia impossibile est."[2]

Such are some of the considerations which are suggested by that Human side of Our Lord's character which it has been the purpose of the preceding pages to set forth. And if we turn to its other or Divine side, we shall find that this also allies itself with a whole world of thoughts, to which the coming of God in the flesh conducts us, and of which that event was the appointed result. To this subject we now approach. For, first, the doctrine of an Incarnate God has an immediate relation to that ultimate nature of Deity, in which lies the beginning of all being, and the end of all truth—on which all knowledge is dependent —which exists in and by itself, as the parent of all action, and the basis of all thought; and secondly, through this doctrine only has the Godhead been revealed to us under that nobler character, in which we have learned to recognize Him. For it is

[1] St. John vii. 15. [2] Tertul. *De Carne Christi*, sec. v.

this truth which has made that mighty alteration in the opinions of men, on which our noblest intellectual attainments are dependent. It is the Incarnation of Christ Our Lord, which has raised us as well above the carnal anthropology of the Greeks, as above the grotesque speculations of the Brahmins. This principle it is, which has so blended justice, mercy, and truth, with the omnipotence, omniscience, and eternity of God, as to enable man to respond to the best aspirations of his nature. If it be true, as the philosophic Cudworth expresses it, that "we have all of us by nature *μάντευμά τι* (as both Plato and Aristotle call it), a certain divination, presage, and parturient vaticination in our minds, of some higher good and perfection than either power or knowledge,"[1] yet was this but uncertain and glimmering, till "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[2] For "no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him."[3]

The moulding together of those mighty elements of moral and intellectual truth, which had been revealed through the Gospel, was the task of the Christian Church during the first five centuries of her age-long existence—a task more arduous far than her other work of remodelling the barbarian hordes, which occupied the next five centuries. Her principle of action in both cases was that indwelling power of the Holy Ghost, by which the body of Christ was never forsaken. Thus, by an inward and an outward work, did the Church prepare the way for the subsequent dawn of European civilization. The result of this process has been handed down to us in our present Creeds, for the perfection of which the Providence of God made wonderful provision in that mighty outspread of the Fourth Empire, by which communication was first widely extended, and an opening made for the progress of Christian

[1] *Intellectual System*, cap. iv. sec. 9.
[2] 2 Corinthians iv. 6. [3] John i. 18.

truth. For subtile as some statements of our Creeds at first sight appear, the whole amount of their varied instruction may be shown to have been held in solution, if the phrase may be employed, in that great central truth, which was made known respecting Jesus Christ our Lord, when He "was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Those parts in them which reach highest, have been attained only by following the ascending line of Scriptural doctrine, as it reversed that wonderful process by which the Son of God left His Father's glory to clothe Himself in mortal flesh. And this circumstance suggests a different course of proceeding from that which was adopted in the preceding Chapters. In treating the nature and acts of man, even though that man be Christ Our Lord, we are dealing with that which is projected before us, as it were on a level surface—which may be described therefore, and measured, as we actually discern it. But when we turn from the Human to the Divine side of Our Lord's character, we have to do with realities which we cannot estimate, till we have viewed them in various relations, and ascertained, as it were, the exact shape of those multiform bodies, of which at first we can form no accurate conception. Here then it will not be enough to take the simple intimations of Scripture by themselves: we must combine them together, as was done in the early age of the Gospel; we must see their reference to the acts of Our Lord's life, and build them up into that harmonious whole which they were intended to present. And how can this be done so effectually as by tracing the process which was actually adopted, when, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Church's system was originally matured? We shall thus see the relation of its several parts, and how the central fact of Our Lord's Incarnation led to the full expression of all Christian doctrines.

The early Church, when she was deprived of the guidance of her inspired teachers, had not reduced the truths which she inherited into that harmonious and connected order, which was

subsequently attained. A sufficient evidence is, that the word Trinity, which afterwards assumed so important a place in her system of belief, was first introduced into her service by Theophilus of Antioch, near the end of the second century. Not that the holy Apostles have been wanting in a complete view of the Gospel, any more than in a knowledge of its individual truths. But their light had not come from learning, but from Revelation. The process of learning is first to accumulate individual facts, and then, by observing the varying relations which they bear to one another, to gain a connected view of the whole field of mental observation. But Revelation, through the mysterious communication of God's Spirit, brings the mind into the same immediate contact with things unseen, which we have with things visible through the organs of the body. Thus is the inner man endowed with the gift of intuition. So was St. Paul "caught up into the third heaven, and heard unspeakable words, which it was not lawful for a man to utter." Thus St. John the Divine saw a door opened into heaven. For Our Lord's promise was, that the Spirit of Truth should guide His disciples "into all truth:" "He will show you things to come." Truth, therefore, properly speaking, belongs to a system or book—Inspiration to its teacher or author. And thus possessing "the mind of Christ," the holy Apostles had that complete insight into the unseen world, which enabled them to comprehend the relations of things, as fully as their individual nature. But it was otherwise, when the truths which they had held in the earthen vessels of perishable mortality were handed over to their successors. To pass from St. Paul to Clement, or to Ignatius from his master, St. John, is to descend at a step to earthly ground from heavenly. The detached writings of the Apostles and Evangelists were in men's hands, but the pregnant relations which their inspired sayings revealed, were but imperfectly apprehended. The simple facts indeed are these: Christ is worshipped, His sacrifice is the sole ground of pardon, union with Him is the only means of grace, the nature and offices of

the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity are recognized, but the rich exuberance of those whose eyes were opened is departed. It was only by gradual steps that the Christian mind gained such practical mastery over its spiritual inheritance, that there arose an Athanasius to contend for the "proportion of faith," and an Augustine to be its exponent. Why it did not please God that the full gifts of the Apostles were continued to their successors, it is not for us to say. But it is plain that the Christian community grew from an infant to a mature state; that the truths, which from the first it firmly held, assumed an ever-increasing consequence and meaning, as discerned by its various generations; that the mind of the Church appeared to advance towards "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;" and that the course which it has pleased God to adopt respecting natural knowledge and individual minds, was not abandoned in the case of that collective body, which was divinely instructed. The process may be illustrated by what befalls every young student, when he becomes acquainted with that systematic view of Our Lord's nature [1] which is given by Hooker. At first probably he admires the majestic and harmonious flow of those weighty sentences, their prodigious grasp of Scriptural truth, and the deep reverence with which they touch things sacred. But though there is nothing which he does not seem to understand, there is in some points a copiousness which he is at a loss to account for. And it is only after repeated perusals, and in many years, that he discerns the full meaning of what had at first fallen idly on his incurious ear, and finds how far this great writer has entered into the deep things of God.

If this happens even when we peruse the writings of an earthly thinker, how much more, when the mysteries of the kingdom of God were proclaimed in the words of Revelation! Hence the numerous heresies which sprung up in the early age of the Church, among those who had the letter of Scripture in

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. c. 51–56.

their hands; and hence likewise, the incapacity of entering into Gospel truth, so often visible in those who have been brought up in error. These things show us the infinite importance of that gradual schooling of the Christian community in the truths of the Gospel, which was completed by the publication and general reception of the Creeds. The mere publication of these documents indeed had been little, but they were not published till every statement which they contain had first been verified; till the various relations of each had been appreciated; till all had been shown to stand in reality on Scriptural authority; till the Christian mind had been prepared by the teaching of the Holy Ghost for their reception; and thus, till a foundation had been laid at once in man's nature and God's truth, on which stands the accumulated weight of our present Christianity.

And here we must carefully distinguish between two things of a very different nature—the authority of the early Christian Church as a witness to facts, and as the propounder of doctrines. Our Article, by speaking of the Church as not only "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," but also as having "authority in controversies of faith," suggests to us clearly this twofold relation. The early Church was a witness to facts, not only in that she received certain books as inspired, but in that she testified to certain practices. When disputes arose respecting the doctrine of Our Lord's Divinity, not only were certain statements to be found in Scripture, but it was an admitted fact, that worship had been paid to Him in all Christian congregations. Thus the Fathers who opposed Paul of Samosata at Antioch, witness to the singing of hymns to Christ as a God, as an acknowledged custom.[1] Again, a second fact, which was witnessed by the Church, was the use of Sacraments. "At the head of the ancient Christian worship," says Professor Dorner, "must be placed the Eucharist, in which the congregation celebrates its atonement with God in Christ, the Mediator between God and mankind; and in the perpetual celebration of this feast is

[1] Eusebius, vii. 31.

seen the first proof of the belief of Christendom in Christ's Divinity." "The second proof," he adds, "is the practice of Holy Baptism."[1] A third fact of the same nature is the existence of those early Creeds to which the Church required men to give their assent in Baptism. For though less detailed than was subsequently required, they all witness a belief in Our Lord's Divinity. A fourth thing is the existence of Doxologies, in which glory was wont to be assigned to Him, in conjunction with the Father and the Holy Ghost. A fifth, is the setting apart of Holy Seasons, in commemoration of His Birth, Death, and Resurrection. A sixth, is the use of Emblems, by which the import of His passion was impressed upon the mind. Here are six several particulars, independently of the preservation of Holy Scripture, in which the early Church witnessed to facts of great importance in the determination of Our Lord's character. But independently of her historical testimony, she possessed an authority in respect to the conclusions to which these facts conducted. That not only are there three Persons in one God, but that the Son is "very God of very God," "of one substance with the Father;"—the Church, when stating this at Nice, was discharging a different function from that which she fulfilled, when witnessing to the facts which have previously been noticed. In the one case, she was only doing what, in his degree, was performed by the heathen Pliny, when he related that the Christians sang hymns to Christ as a God. In the other, she was certainly exercising some "authority in controversies of faith." In the former case, her claim to respect is to be tested by the ordinary rules of evidence. But what is it in the latter? It stands on the validity of that promise, which assures us that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, and which assumes therefore that the Body of Christ will never be deserted by that guiding Spirit, which is as necessary for truth as for obedience. The help of the Holy

[1] Dorner's *Lehre von der Person Christi*, cap. i. vol. i. p. 274 (a work of which great use has been made in the present Chapter).

Ghost is no doubt an abiding succour, which is given according to the wants and circumstances of the inheritance of God. In one age it speaks by physical miracles, in another through that moral influence which renews the life. And so too did it display itself in the Church's guidance. In the Apostles there was that original communication of all truth, which was given once for all, for the instruction of mankind. The subsequent direction of God's Spirit was for the purpose only of interpreting what had already been delivered. Thus was it always regarded in ancient times, and unless thus restrained, the Spirit's guidance might be a warrant for Neology on one side, or Mahometanism on the other. Whereas the Christian covenant was from the first understood to be God's final dispensation with man. "There have been two changes in man's life," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, "which accompanied the two Testaments, and which from their greatness might be called shakings of the earth. And a third earth-shaking does Scripture tell us of, when this earthly state, namely, shall yield to that which is unshaken and eternal." [1]

The Church's "authority in controversies of faith," requires therefore, as its constant counterpoise, the paramount authority of Holy Writ. To adjust such varying claims may in some cases be difficult. But no such difficulty displayed itself in that early age, in which the system of her belief was embodied in the Creeds. For since no division has yet impaired her unity, the promise of Christ's presence was with her in its fulness, and the weight of her decision was without abatement. Had her interpretation of the fundamentals of the Gospel been erroneous, how had Christ's promise in her favour been fulfilled? This circumstance invests her judgment on these momentous subjects with an importance superadded to that which the fact of her testimony naturally commands. There are those, indeed, who seem as though they would be glad to divest themselves of the advantage of such decisions. They would rather fall back on the unre-

[1] *Oratio* 37, sec. 58.

flecting simplicity of that early faith, which rested only on the single facts of the Gospel. But this is to be ignorant that the gradual expansion of Christian doctrines was only the growth of the religious mind, as under the moulding power of the Holy Ghost, it compared the individual truths with which it had been entrusted. Those truths must have resolved themselves into wrong combinations, if they had not been resolved into right ones. The Body of Christ must have grown up in an unnatural and distorted shape, if the informing Spirit had not fulfilled its appointed function of guiding it into all truth. In the earnest obedience of the early age, when the warmth of love dispensed with the maturity of knowledge, there was a moment indeed, when the outward growth of the Church scarce left time to embody what was believed in abstract formularies. But this infant security depended either on the personal guidance of the inspired Apostles, or on the witness of men, to whom, as to St. Ignatius, long habits of intercourse with the first leaders had given such confidence respecting their decisions, both in faith and in practice, that a reference to the general principles of the Church's existence was not yet required. And those who seek to regain it by throwing away what was earned by the religious impulse then given to the age, do but restore the imbecility of childhood without its innocence.

The work, then, at present before us, is to consider by what gradual steps the testimony of Scripture, illustrated by the practice of the Apostles, led to that matured statement of the doctrine of Our Lord's Divinity, to which the Church was directed by the Holy Ghost. For though the doctrine itself had been understood from the first, yet its expression became more comprehensive, as through the Spirit's guidance its full relations were more adequately appreciated. To trace the actual progress of thought is the best exhibition, therefore, of the truth of Our Lord's Divinity, since it shows how indissolubly this doctrine is bound up with the whole system of the Divine nature; and

since it likewise illustrates its influence as the basis of all the religious instincts of Christendom. For in this manner it will appear that the whole system of the Church's faith was elicited in the defence of this its one cardinal principle: that the vindication of Christian piety led to those deep inquiries which enlarged and exalted the conceptions of mankind. Indeed, the primary importance of the worship of the God-man, is as manifest from the conduct of the Church's assailants, as from that of her children: for during the earlier ages of her existence, no enemies assaulted her, by whom the doctrine of His sacred Person was not assailed as the first and most prominent part of her system. Their assaults may be referred in general to three classes. In the second century, they were grounded chiefly on a view of the nature of man, and of the impossibility of an union between him and his Maker. During the third and fourth centuries, on the other hand, the prevalent heresies arose from speculations on the Divine nature, and on the want of coherence between belief in Christ and the unity of the Godhead. And this brings us in the fifth century to a third class of disputes. Our Lord being admitted to be both God and man, the question which remained was as to the manner in which these two natures were united.

Confining ourselves in this Chapter to disputes of the first and second kind, we may observe that the argument advanced through the first into the second. It was when the difficulties which had been suggested by the thought of Christ's manhood had been in a measure overcome, that they awoke again in relation to the Unity of the Godhead. Thus did they rise from the lower to the higher nature. And in each age the assailants might be resolved generally into two classes, those who questioned the Deity, and those who questioned the Humanity of Christ. The Arians were in some sort the successors of the Ebionites, and the Gnostics were precursors of the Sabellian and Apollinarian school. The Ebionites were among the first antagonists by whom the Christian mind was called forth

to the survey and defence of the truths entrusted to it. They formed the small and unimportant party, rather arising from the Church than in it, which questioned the Divine character of Our Lord. Their influence was so slight in early times, that they would be lost sight of, but for the diligence of Eusebius,[1] and a few other ancient authors. They rose probably out of the Jewish Christians, and had retained the notion, attributed by Justin to that nation, that Christ would be only a man, and born of men.[2] Hence perhaps their name (*poor*), from their entertaining, says Eusebius, poor and low notions of Christ; unless it was derived from the meanness and want of instruction which characterized their party. They are remarkable only for affording the original example of that error which afterwards displayed itself in a more dangerous shape.

The popular error of the second century lay on the opposite side, and consisted in a denial of Our Lord's Humanity. The works which He had wrought had been so marvellous, and His worship was so universal among His disciples, that those who left the middle way of truth were generally inclined to deny that there could be any human nature in one whose Godhead was so manifest. This error of the Gnostics was encouraged by the prevalent philosophy of the East, where it especially extended itself; according to which all corruption lay in the fleshly part of man, and spirit was confounded with purity. Supposing matter therefore to be the sole principle of evil, and ignorant that defilement lies in reality in sin, whether of body or mind, the Gnostics supposed Our Lord to be a Divine Spirit who came only in the form of man, without being really united to manhood. This was the other extreme of error; and its earlier growth and greater popularity is shown by the testimony which is borne against it by the Beloved Disciple: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."[3]

[1] Eusebius, iii. 27. [2] *Dial. cum Tryph.* sec. 49. [3] 1 John iv. 3.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Either of these heretical opinions was subversive of the Christian faith; since the one represented the object of our hope to be a mere creature, and the other denied Him that participation with ourselves, on which rests our salvation. Those who adopted them were, of course, excluded from the Church's communion; yet, though merely hovering on the verge of the faith, they chose to call themselves Christians. But, since they were not constituent parts of the Christian body, it was not necessary to meet their errors by any official decree of the Church's rulers; it was left to single writers at their will to oppose and confute them. Two of great consideration arose in the middle and latter part of the second century, Justin Martyr and St. Irenæus. The former may be referred perhaps to the school of St. Paul, the latter to that of St. John, though Irenæus keeps far closer to his guide, and enters far more deeply into the Spirit of the Gospel than the philosophic Justin.[1]

In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Justin Martyr sets forth the ground upon which the Ebionite denial of Our Lord's Divinity was to be confuted. His arguments rest upon a review of those predictions of the Old Testament respecting the character of Messiah which are inconsistent with the notion that He who bore it was merely a human being. From the argument of prophecy he passes to Our Lord's title of the Word: maintaining Him to be as closely bound, as its very attributes, to Godhead itself. "I will give you Scripture proof," he says, that "God begot from Himself a certain intellectual form, as a beginning which preceded all creation, which is sometimes called by the Holy Ghost—God's glory, sometimes His Son, sometimes Wisdom, sometimes His Angel, sometimes God, sometimes the Lord and the *Word*."[2] And again, speaking of His presence among men; "the[3] omnipotent and invisible God from heaven

[1] Mohler's *Einheit der Kirche*, sec. 35.

[2] *Dial. cum Tryph.* sec. 61, p. 157.

[3] *Ad Diognet.* sec. 7. Whether this letter be Justin's or not, it is, the Benedictine editors say, "S. Martyre dignissimum."

has Himself placed among men His truth and Holy Word—not as one might suppose sending a minister or an angel—but the very Artificer and Maker of all things." "As a king, sending His royal Son, has He despatched Him." This Being, Justin speaks of as containing in Himself, as a source and centre, all the light and reason, of which faint adumbrations are to be met with among men. "Whatever has been well spoken or discovered by philosophers or legislators, has been owing to that partial discovery and observation of the Word, to which their labours conducted them. But because they had no complete knowledge of the Word, who is Christ, they fell into many contradictions."[1] Thus would he account for the fact, that Plato's teaching is in so far "not contrary to that of Christ,"[2] that he likewise believed in "those three divine hypostases, that have the nature of principles in the Universe, viz., monad, mind, and soul."[3] Indeed, if in the secret abyss of infinite Being we recognize the mysterious Three as the primal source of all existence, what more natural, to say nothing of an original revelation, than that man's heart should have such natural affinity to this belief, as to lead deep thinkers to anticipate it? "Each one, therefore," says Justin, "spoke well, according as through the seminal principle of the Divine Word, he described something which was akin to his nature." "And whatever they said well belongs to us Christians. For the Word of the unbegotten and ineffable God, we worship and love together with God, since for our sakes He became man, that being partaker of our sufferings He might cure them."[4]

Having thus declared Christ to be God's Wisdom or Word in its completeness,[5] he shows His pre-existence,[6] and that He shared the councils[7] of the Father before the world was. Finally, he points out that Our Lord had an inherent and

[1] *Apol. II.* sec. x. p. 95.
[2] *Apol. II.* sec. xiii. p. 97.
[3] Cudworth's *Intell. Sys* iv. 36.
[4] *Apol. II.* sec. xiii. p. 98.
[5] *Apol. II.* sec. viii. p. 94.
[6] *Apol. I.* sec. lxiii. p. 81.
[7] *Ep. ad Diog.* viii. p. 238.

independent, not merely a conditional and relationary existence, both as regards the works of Creation and the Father Himself. For He was "the Son of God, the only real Son, who was with God before all creation."[1] "And He it is who was seen by Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, and who is called God—other than the God who is the original of all things; that is, other in number [*i.e.*, person] not in mind."[2]

The writings of St. Irenæus against the Gnostics are built upon the same doctrine of "the Incarnate Word," which is brought forward by Justin, but St. Irenæus is far fuller and deeper in his view of Gospel truth, and his solutions of the errors he refutes are far more satisfactory. On one side he has a truer view of the character of God, on the other a profounder sense of the wants of humanity. The teaching of Justin shows signs of a more recent conversion from Heathenism; and the tendency which had been derived from the schools of philosophy, is not so completely subordinated to the principles of the new Revelation. According to his system, we should be in danger of resting the Godhead upon the mere heathen ground of intellectual greatness; and the Word who manifests Him, though His goodness is not left unnoticed, would be regarded too exclusively in His character of the "Light of men." But St. Irenæus discerns that what constitutes the Godhead is neither mere immensity nor abstract substance, but that ultimate self-originating personal existence, of which the characteristic is Love. The words of the Beloved Apostle are thus a guiding star to him who had sat at the feet of his disciple. The Word of God, therefore, by whom the Divine character is manifested, is in like manner distinguished by that attribute which is proper to Deity. "The one God, who made and arranged everything by His Word and Wisdom, is the real Creator, who assigned this world to the human race, who, in regard to His greatness, is unknown to all His creatures (for His depths, none either of past or present men have sounded); but as respects His love,

[1] *Apol. II.* sec. vi. p. 92.

[2] *Cum Tryph.* lvi. p. 152.

He is known by Him, through whom He made all things. For this is His Word, Jesus Christ Our Lord, who in these last times was made a man among men, that He might join the end to the beginning—that is, man to God."[1] And in another place he says, that "the immensity of God and his substance are things beyond human estimation, for no man has ever measured nor handled them; but what falls within man's perception is His love."[2] This is his mode of answering the Gnostic speculators, whose effort was to resolve Christianity into a sort of Theogony, and thus to ally it to Oriental fables. And Irenæus, after showing them the true source in which they should seek for the knowledge of God, declares all other inquiries respecting Him to be vain and unsatisfactory, since He is an ultimate Personality, and not resolvable into fate[3] or any higher law. "Non enim excogitabis."[4] "Canst thou by searching find out God?" "He[5] who seeks it, unless he repent, will float about for ever in the ocean of incomprehensibility."[6]

Having thus shown that the basis of the Gnostic errors was an imperfect estimate of the nature of God, he passes to that particular heresy in which these opinions manifested their effect; —their denial, namely, of the humanity of Christ. To suppose Immensity to be the essence of Deity, was nearly connected with supposing what was tangible and material to be its direct opponent. Hence the feeling that it was impossible that the Supreme Mind should manifest itself in the flesh. Against this opinion St. Irenæus puts the declaration of Scripture, and the constant belief of the Church, that "Our Lord redeemed us by His own blood, and gave His life for our life, and His flesh for our flesh."[7] He discriminates between mere natural limitation, which belongs to material being, and that moral corruption,

[1] S. Irenæus, iv. 20, 4, p. 254 [Massuet].
[2] Ibid. iii. 24, 2, p. 223.
[3] Ibid. ii. 5, 4, p. 121.
[4] Ibid. ii. 25, 4, p. 153.
[5] Ibid. iv. 9, 3, p. 238.
[6] "Quemadmodum poterit quis intelligere aut cognoscere in corde tam magnum Deum?"—*Ibid.* iv. 19, 3, p. 252.
[7] S. Iren. v. 1, 1, p. 292.

which is the consequence of sin. Without the removal of the last, he says, there was some natural impossibility in man's salvation;[1] whereas the admixture of material elements in man's nature was only a part of that perfect[2] construction in which he was originally made. And that Christ our Lord participated in them, was shown by abundant individual indications. Why else should He have been hungry after His fast, or weary after His journey? Why should He have wept at the tomb of Lazarus, or in His Passion have shed drops of blood?[3] But Irenæus goes deeper than this, and is not satisfied by such mere incidental notices of Our Lord's Humanity. He seems to have feared lest these signs of sympathy in one who was also a Divine Being, should be looked upon only as individual instances of gratuitous condescension; as an assumed conformity to our lot, rather than an actual co-partnership in our nature. This was exactly what was afterwards maintained by the Aphthartodocetæ,[4] a sect of Eutychians; and thus was Christ's sympathy with ourselves divested of its reality. To guard against such an error, Irenæus insists on that relation between Christ and humanity at large, which is revealed in Scripture; and thus lays a foundation for the apparent facts of His life, in the principles which were essential to its object. "For if He had not of man taken the substance of flesh, He would not have been man or the Son of Man: and if He had not been made what we were, He would not have done so great a thing in His sufferings."[5] This relation of Christ to man he grounds on those passages of Holy Scripture which speak of Christ as the antitype of Adam, "whence also, by St. Paul, Adam is called the type of Him who was to

[1] "Impossibile erat ut salutem perciperet qui sub peccato ceciderat."—*S. Irenæus*, iii. 18, 2, p. 209.

[2] S. Iren. v. 6, 1, p. 299.

[3] S. Iren. iii. 22, 2, p. 219. S. Leo, *Ep.* xxiv. 4.

[4] "Oportebat non solum velle, sed fecisse Deum aliquid erga nos."—*Leontius*, c. *Nest. et Eutych. Lib. Max. Pat.* ix. 688. *Vide Pet. de Inc.* x. 3.

[5] S. Iren. iii. 22, 1, p. 218.

come;"[1] and likewise on the declarations which it contains of a real unity of nature between Christ and His ransomed brethren. In this system he seems to have discerned that peculiar fitness and harmony to which Hooker apparently refers, when he says that "Christ's Incarnation and Passion can be available to no man's good, which is not made partaker of Christ, neither can we participate Him without His presence;"[2] but his conclusions do not rest on mere natural arguments, but on the inspired sayings of the Apostles. And to these no one could refer with greater confidence than one who professes to have learnt the general purpose of their teaching from their immediate disciples. "It was necessary that He who began to destroy sin, and to redeem men who deserved death, should Himself be made partaker of that nature, which by sin had been brought into servitude, and was enthralled by death, that so sin might be destroyed by man, and man might be delivered from death. 'For as by the disobedience of one man,' who was formed originally out of the virgin earth, 'many were made sinners,' and lost their life, 'so by the obedience of One' who from a virgin had His origin, many have been justified and obtained salvation. Thus, therefore, was the Word of God made man. In the words of Moses, it was truly God's work. For if He had only obeyed as flesh, and not become flesh, it had been no real work. He became that which was obedient: God, by taking the elements of manhood, became Himself a new head to man's original race, that He might destroy sin, deprive death of its sting, and give mankind life."[3]

There are two particular points to which Irenæus refers, as evidencing the reality of the relation, which has been thus described: the one, Our Lord's sacrifice upon the Cross; the other, that real communion with Himself, which He vouchsafes in the Lord's Supper. "If the flesh is not saved, then did not Christ redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor is the bread which we break,

[1] S. Iren. iii. 22, 3, p. 219. [2] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 55, 1.
[3] S. Iren. iii. 18, 7, p. 211.

the communion of His body. It could not be blood, unless there were flesh; veins, and whatever else belongs to man's substance: yet all this the Word must truly have taken, for He redeemed us with His blood; as the Apostle says, 'in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins.'"[1] In referring to the Holy Communion as evidencing the truth of Our Lord's humanity, St. Irenæus appeals to the testimony of the early Church, that the gifts of grace are obtained through union with the man Jesus Christ, in as real a manner as forgiveness of sins was purchased by His blood. Is it, then, that as His earthly body was nailed upon the Cross, so it is divided into morsels, and eaten as natural food by men? Such was the notion of the Capharnaites; and the same opinion, with the addition that Our Lord's material body is capable of being distributed in portions, without limit and without destruction, and also that men's senses are supernaturally withheld from discerning it, is denied by our Church under the name of Transubstantiation. What other interpretations may be given to a word unknown to antiquity, and how far, considering the technical nature of the term *substance*, a more refined construction of it may harmonize with the decrees of the Council of Trent, is a question for those who have to subscribe its formularies. The Capharnaite notion, however, must imply that some supernatural effect is connected with the eating of Our Lord's body, since naturally it would act only as common food. And such supernatural effect is attributed to it by all who, without holding a carnal presence, believe with our Church that "the inward part or thing signified" in the Holy Communion is "the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Now this is all which is requisite, to give its force to the argument of St. Irenæus. That argument turns on the belief that Our Lord's Humanity, through spiritual supernatural influence, is in the Holy Communion the consecrating principle of ours. It implies,

[1] S. Irenæus, v. 2, 2, p. 293. S. Leo. *Ep.* 24, 5.

of course, that the participation of Our Lord's body in the Holy Communion is not merely figurative, that it is not a mere memorial of His death, an acted sermon on His sufferings; and it is a point of no little moment, that one who had been nurtured in the faith by St. John's disciple, and who lived within half a century of the writing of his Gospel, should have thought this assertion so clear, that the reality of the Atonement and the Resurrection could be built upon it. For he reasons back from the reality of the gift bestowed, to the reality of the source from which it emanates; and considers it a sufficient argument against the Docetæ, that Christ must be truly man, since we are truly benefited by union with His manhood. Whereas the heretical party, believing Christ's Incarnation and Death to be only a representation, supposed, naturally enough, that His presence in the Eucharist was only a figurative process, by which our imagination was strongly impressed, and that neither was there in Christ any real body to produce an effect upon us, nor were the bodies of mankind to be quickened at the resurrection. The renewal of "body, soul, and spirit," to which the Apostle refers, was lost sight of with the belief in Our Lord's Body. On the reality then of the human body of Our Lord, stands, according to Irenæus, the certainty of mankind's resurrection. That he supposes the media through which its sanctifying agency extends itself to the Christian, to continue to be actual elements of bread and wine, is shown by his repeated reference to their earthly character,[1] subject, as the Gnostics supposed, to the Demiurgus or Lord of this world, whose gifts they thought could not be made subservient to the purposes of God. This opinion he refutes, by showing that they are the means of communicating that mysterious union, whereby men are bound to the Second, as by nature they were to the first Adam. It follows, since our whole union with the second Adam is not by natural descent, but by supernatural alliance, that His presence therefore in the Eucharist, however true and real, must not be by carnal inter-

[1] S. Iren. iv. 33, 2, p. 270, and iv. 18, 4, p. 251.

penetration, but by spiritual power. "The mixture of [Christ's] bodily substance with ours is a thing which the ancient Fathers disclaim. Yet the mixture of His flesh with ours they speak of, to signify what our very bodies, through mystical conjunction, receive from that vital efficacy which we know to be in His; and from bodily mixtures they borrow divers similitudes, rather to declare the truth, than the manner of coherence between His sacred and the sanctified bodies of Saints."[1] Accordingly, Irenæus says, "When the mixed cup, and the bread which results from growth, receives[2] the word of God, the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ, and from them the substance of our flesh receives increase and corroboration. How then can they say that there is no capacity for that gift of God, which is eternal life, in the flesh which is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, and becomes a part of Him? as the blessed Paul says in his Epistle to the Ephesians, 'we are members of His body: of His flesh, and of His bones.'"[3]

Other passages would illustrate the same deep view of Christ's relation to Humanity, as, for instance, the striking one in the Fourth Book (xviii. 4), which is cited by Hooker. But what has been adduced is sufficient proof that St. Irenæus, with the rest of the early Church, maintained our Lord's Manhood as certainly as His Godhead. The two natures were believed to be absolutely joined together in one Person. Was there anything which belonged of necessary right to the nature of man, it might certainly be attributed to Him; was there anything which could not be separated from Godhead, it could not be denied Him. These two widely-separated characters in one single person made up His Being. As God He was the object of all honour and worship: as man He had offered His body on the Cross, and was still presenting it in heaven as the ground of intercession and the source of graces.

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 56, 9.

[2] "Accedit verbum *i.e.*, of consecration) ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum."—*S. Aug. in Joan.* lxxx. 3.

[3] S. Irenæus, v. 2, 3, p. 294.

Thus did the first assaults upon the cardinal principle of the Christian faith lead to a clear and full assertion that in Christ Our Lord, two natures, Godhead and Manhood, were perfectly manifested. The time however was now come when the influx of educated and thoughtful men into the Church made it necessary to give this great truth a more adequate expression. In the third century of the Christian æra, to the consideration of which we now come, there arose a new set of objectors, to try men's allegiance to the Gospel. These were no longer external to the Church, like the Ebionites and Gnostics: they had passed within it. Their assaults were not directed, like the errors of the second century, against the avowed principle of Christianity, that man was God and God man; they had learned the more subtile and dangerous policy of amending rather than disputing it. They were ready to admit the Church's doctrine in name, if in reality they might reject it. They claimed to interpret it in such wise as should not clash with another leading doctrine of the Scripture revelation, the Unity of God. For whereas the objections of the preceding age had been built on a regard to the constitution of man's nature, those which now arose were derived rather from the nature of God. The unity of the Divine Being was one essential point which the new revelation had to maintain against Polytheism. With this fundamental principle of Christianity, the real belief in Christ as God was asserted to be inconsistent. "They charge us with setting forth two Gods or three," reports Tertullian, "while they assert themselves to be worshippers of but one. We hold, they say, to the monarchy."[1] There was plainly this difficulty, that Christ as man was one individual in a class containing many members. If His other nature could be dealt with in a corresponding manner—if His Divine Being could be spoken of as, in like manner, one out of many—what difference would there be between Christianity and the religion of the heathen? Hence the various attempts which were made in the third century to explain away the Christian doctrines

[1] *Adv. Praxeam*, 3.

without absolutely rejecting them. These attempts were met by no less strenuous efforts on the part of more enlightened believers to guard the ancient deposit of Christian truth by insisting on the real reception of the very same belief which had originally existed. Hence the introduction of new forms of expression to negative those several misconceptions by which the ingenuity of men would have perverted the great facts of revelation. "Just as the heathen make gods with their hands," says Tertullian, "so do the heretics by their words, while they introduce a different God and a different Christ."[1] "It was in maintaining, therefore, the character of Christ, that there rose all those disputes respecting the Doctrine of the Trinity, which existed in the early Church."[2] To assert our Lord to be merely the Divine Wisdom, as had been done by Justin Martyr, and thus to assign Him a place among the attributes of God, was soon found to be insufficient. On this showing, was there not a danger lest His personality should be wholly lost in the infinite perfection of the one God? But suppose that to escape this difficulty His mission to create the world was insisted on, and He was thus exhibited as invested plainly with a personal character. Yet such a personality was merely drawn from God's works; it depended on the visible creation; it was not deep enough to serve for the personal identification of an Eternal Being. So that two conditions which belonged plainly to the great object of the Church's worship, that He was the Word or Wisdom of the Father, and that by Him the worlds were made, were not only insufficient, when taken in themselves, as the determining characteristics of His character, but, in fact, became the very germinant principles of the great heresies of the age. For what was this denial of the real personality of the Son of God, but the heresy which afterwards became so fatal under the names of Sabellian, Patripassian, or Apollinarian? while to rest Our Lord's Being on His relation to the external world, was that more consistent heresy of Arius

[1] *Adv. Praxeam*, sec. 18.
[2] Dorner's *Person Christi*, vol. i. p. 940.

to which the others conducted. If it pleased God to embody the abstract attribute of His wisdom in a personal substance for the creation of the world, the Being so employed was only a creature, distinguished by greater responsibility from the things which He created. "Refer Our Lord's Godhead only to His resemblance to the Divine attributes, and His personality was lost in the Unity of God; prove His personality by His activity in creation, and His Godhead was lost in the created universe. If God be not personally distinguished from God, the principle of discrimination is not founded in the inner nature of God, but depends only on His relation to the world. And thus the Son becomes only a secondary, accidental, contingent thing, like the world of creation. So that unless the conditions which discriminate the Son's personality are sought for in God Himself, Arianism must of necessity follow."[1]

It was essential then to meet the inquiring spirit of the age, by laying down the precise limits of that idea under which the worship of the God-man had existed from the foundation of the Church. The right course had been marked out by St. Irenæus, in a manner sufficient for the requirements of the second century. For first he distinguishes between the Creator and the creation, pointing out that Our Lord was not only in Himself an invisible[2] power, ever present[3] with the Father, but that His Being was not dependent on the world's existence—the world having been created in subsequent time to show forth God's glory.[4] This supplies Him not only with a safeguard against the danger of a general Pantheism, the principle of which is to merge the personality of the moral Governor in the circle of His works, but it is a protest by anticipation against the Arian heresy, the essential feature of which was to represent the existence of the Son as relative only to creation. On the other hand, Irenæus makes provision against Sabellian misrepresentations, by discriminating the person of the Word from that of the Father. He disclaims

[1] Dorner's *Person Christi*, i. 449.
[2] S. Irenæus, iv. 24, 2, p. 260.
[3] Ibid., iv. 20, 1, p. 253.
[4] Ibid., iv. 14, 1, p. 243.

such estimate of the nature of the Word as might be drawn from the application of the same terms to man. "When you explain His generation from the Father, and transfer to the Word of God ideas drawn from the utterance of words from the tongue of man, you are clearly detected to be ignorant of what is human as well as what is Divine."[1]

These explanations were sufficient, so long as the tendency which it was necessary to oppose, showed itself in the shape of Ebionism and Gnosticism. But more was required when they ripened into the Arian and Sabellian heresies. That they are the very same tendencies are obvious; for while Arianism is the professed denial of Our Lord's real Divinity, the Sabellian notion, that the Son is not personally distinct from the Father, but merely one side or phase of the Father's character, is an obvious revival of the notion of an emanation from the Godhead, and is fatal therefore to the real permanent coherence of God and man in the one Person of Christ. So that while Arianism tends directly towards creature worship, the Sabellian heresy implies the denial of any real intervention of the Son of God as the Saviour of mankind.

There was no want of opponents to these errors when they began to display themselves within the Church. The course indicated by Irenæus was followed by Tertullian, who marked out more carefully the Son's independence of the external world, by observing that He was one *in substance*[2] with the Father. Thus was He taken altogether out of the class of created beings. The explanations of Origen were still more complete.[3] He introduced the phrase of the "Son's eternal generation," which was at once adopted by the whole Church, as expressing the exact view of Our Lord's relation to the Godhead, which had always been delivered to them. Thus was secured the notion of a perpetual

[1] S. Irenæus, ii. 28, 5, p. 157. [2] *Adv. Praxeam*, sec. 4.

[3] "Est namque ita æterna ac sempiterna generatio sicut splendor generatus ex luce. Non enim per adoptionem spiritus Filius fit extrinsecus, sed naturâ Filius est."—*De Principiis*, 1, 2, 4.

generation, in which time had no part; and since the discriminating considerations of the Son's personality were thus laid in the nature of the Deity itself, the Sabellian confusion was escaped, and yet the Deity was not rendered dependent upon His works.

It is not to be supposed, indeed, that the early writers could always use expressions incapable of being taken in a partial and erroneous sense. While the relations of the great truths they handed down were imperfectly apprehended, it was impossible to foresee of what further enlargement either words or ideas were susceptible. And this is the ground of those complaints against them which have been made by Petavius, and more recently by Mr. Newman. It is not alleged that the ideas which they entertained were incorrect, but that in comprehending their relations, and clothing them in language, they did not go beyond the wants of their generation. But it is only when taken out of their place, and applied in a sense in which they were not intended, that the expressions of these ancient writers can be said to be erroneous. Take them in reference to that particular stage in the progress of opinion to which they were adapted, and the imputation is ungrounded. The traveller who inclines to the right to-day is not deviating from his course because he will incline to the left to-morrow. It must not be supposed, therefore, that the holy men of the first three centuries were in error respecting any of the great truths of the Gospel; though the Church's mind was gradually led on by the Holy Ghost to a more complete appreciation of all their multiform relations. And one resource was resorted to in the third century, which in the second had been found needless—the authority of Councils. This had not been needful while the enemy lay without the Church. It was enough for the Bishops to exclude those from the communion of the faithful who opposed her acknowledged doctrines. Marcion was first excommunicated by his own father, the Bishop of Synope, and when he sought the capital, he was again sentenced by the Bishop of Rome, as the common father of its citizens. But in the third

century, we find no less than three local Councils, which opened the way for that great assembly at Nice, in which the Catholic doctrines were fully vindicated. The first two of these were directed against Sabellian tenets, which were propagated in the one case by the disciples of Noetus of Smyrna;[1] in the other by the Arabian Bishop Beryllus. In the latter instance, Beryllus, the author of the error, was himself reclaimed by the arguments of Origen.[2] We learn from Socrates,[3] that the Synod which opposed Beryllus dwelt especially on the existence of Christ's human soul, a fact which, though plainly implied by earlier writers (as Irenæus and Tertullian), for they speak of Our Lord as ignorant according to His manhood, had been first put in a clear light by Origen. The errors of Beryllus had been those which are commonly maintained by Sabellians, that Our Lord, before His Incarnation, was not really discriminated by any personal distinction from the Father, and that when He came upon earth, it was not His own, but the Father's Deity which dwelt in Him.[4] The effect of this theory was to represent the Blessed Trinity as a mere set of relations or characters, under which the same individual displayed himself; and these relations were supposed therefore to be increased when the work of creation brought the Deity in contact with a new set of objects. Two objections may be made to it, independently of its inconsistency with the statements of revelation: first, that the Godhead might as readily have assumed any number of Persons as those three, in which it has been its will to be revealed; and secondly (as will shortly be proved), that to explain away Our Lord's personality was inconsistent with the reality of His Incarnation. It was on this side that Sabellianism was most plainly inconsistent with that first principle of the Christian Church—its reverence for Christ Our Lord; and, therefore, it was by a perception of this danger

[1] His opinions are recorded by S. Hippolytus—*Contra Noetum*, i. 5.—Vide Routh's *Rel. Sac.* ii. p. 374 [1st Ed.].
[2] Eus. *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 23.
[3] *Hist.* iii. 7.
[4] Eusebius, u. s.

that Beryllus was reclaimed from his errors. For when he had learnt, through the teaching of Origen, to form a deeper estimate of Our Lord's real and separate existence as the God-man (endowed not only with human flesh, but a reasonable soul), he saw that it was essential to seek for the distinguishing conditions of His personality within the sacred precincts of Deity itself.

The third Council held in this century, against Paul of Samosata, had no such prosperous issue; but it was not less important, as a precautionary guard against what was afterwards the Arian heresy. Paul was condemned for denying that first principle of the faith, Our Lord's real Divinity, just as Arius was condemned afterwards. And as the Fathers who opposed Noetus declared that they were not introducing any new theory, but only maintaining the truths which had been delivered to them—"we say that which we have learnt"—so the Council at Antioch, after affirming the reality of Our Lord's Godhead against Paul, concludes with an assertion that "all the Catholic Churches agree with us."[1] This Council carries us on to that celebrated assembly at Nice, A. D. 325, for the celebration of which such providential preparation had been made by the ascendancy of Constantine. Its creed contains the broadest possible assertion of Our Lord's real Divinity. The second General Council, held during this century at Constantinople, followed likewise in the same track, and filled in certain particulars of the outline which had already been delineated. Besides its main work, the assertion of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, it condemned the Apollinarian heresy, by which Our Lord's Humanity was called in question. In neither of these Councils, however, was anything concluded, except what all the Fathers declared to have been received from the beginning in their several Churches. For the ascending line of Christian truth was only the prolongation of that first principle of the Gospel—that Christ was perfect God and perfect man, in the full completeness of both these relations.

[1] Eus. *Eccl. Hist.* vii. 30.

And as it has pleased God that His Church has never been without a champion in its hour of need: as the expounder and indomitable advocate of the creed of Nice, there was raised up the *great Athanasius.*

From his teaching did this momentous Doctrine of our religion receive that full elucidation, which showed the relation of its various parts, and vindicated for revealed religion its proper superiority. His four Orations against the Arians have remained as a rich mine of truth for all subsequent generations. The Trinity in Unity we must receive, according to him as a real mystery in the eternal Godhead, which has partially been revealed to mankind. There are those who deny that we are taught anything of God's nature, and allege religion to consist only in our relation to some Being who is incomprehensible. That our ideas must be infinitely inadequate is obvious; but unless there be an object without us, to which to direct our thoughts, relative is as impossible as positive knowledge. Unless we have some objective knowledge of the Deity, our subjective knowledge of Him is only a dream. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him."[1] "He who comes to God, or enters himself in the Church of God, must first believe that there is a God in some intelligible sense; and not only that there is something in general without any proper notion, though never so inadequate, of any of its qualities or attributes—for this may be fate, or chaos, or plastic nature, or anything else as well as a God." "We may say," indeed, "that as God is infinitely above men, so is the knowledge of God infinitely above the knowledge of men. And after this

[1] "Moral infinity as well as mathematical: moral modes in their highest degree, as well as modes of quantity in its unlimited extent: are subject to some rules of discourse, when we discourse of them at all; and one rule is, that in passing up the scale of the finite subject, in order to approach the properties of the infinite, we must pursue the enlarged idea taken from the properties of the first, and not adopt the contradictory or any alien idea, to make the approximation to the infinite in question." —*Davison on Prophecy*, p. 548.

same analogy, we must understand all those attributes to belong to the Deity, which in themselves simply and as such denote perfection."[1] But unless our faith have a counterpart in some external reality, it is but a delusive imagination. All explanations, therefore, respecting the Divine nature must begin with the fact, of which revelation has assured us, that in the Unity of the Godhead there are Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Now, the first and most essential condition of belief in this fact, is to acknowledge that it is a mystery. For the Apostles speak of the nature of God and of His relation to mankind as mysteries. The first is the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, the second the mystery of the Incarnation. These two are necessarily linked together, inasmuch as the first is approached through the second; and the second can never be really accepted without the admission of the first. They form between them "the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ."[2] It is not meant, of course, that they involve a contradiction in terms, for did they do so, we might deny with as much truth as we can affirm them. But, by asserting them to be mysteries, the Apostles teach us that it has pleased God to give us an actual external object in His own nature, consisting of features and characteristics, which in our present state we are unable to harmonize; but which faith in Him who bestows them assures us will eventually resolve themselves into one consistent whole. Such has been the case already in a great measure respecting the world of matter; such will no doubt be the case hereafter respecting the world of mind. Various incongruities in the external universe, which perplexed Lucretius, have been cleared up by Newton and Davy: and those incompatibilities which were suggested by Arius and Sabellius, will prove hereafter to be equally illusory. The individual truths respecting God which we learn from revelation must therefore be held as firmly as the individual phenomena

[1] *Minute Philosopher*, Dial. iv. 18, 21.

[2] Colossians ii. 2.

which we learn from observation. We cannot expect that in our present state we can perfectly harmonize them. What we should aim at is, to discern the limits which have been laid down on either side, without endeavouring to draw them together forcibly by the bond of a logical connexion.

In respect to the Blessed Trinity, for example, the peculiar difficulty which is experienced in its real reception, by those who do not discern that its transcendent nature raises it above our ordinary laws of thought, is that our common notion of spiritual beings is derived from that internal principle which we call Personality. This indivisible principle in our nature, with which consciousness is intimately connected, is what gives us the power of speaking of *ourselves*. It is the "*ego*," the "*Ich*" of our being. Here, then, there is some fixed principle, whereby our own consciousness assures us that we are dissevered from all other beings. So that if earthly faculties are adequate to the complete resolution of heavenly questions, we may go on, and deal with the principles of personality and individuality as being always identical. We may say further, that to attribute this principle of individuality to Godhead at large, would be to deny its applicability to the Three Persons; or to assert that it was absolutely identical with that which might be attributed to the Three separate Persons, would be to deny that it had any relevancy to Godhead at large. And yet to deny its applicability to either of them, would seem on the one hand to detract too much from the oneness of the Supreme Being;[1] and, on the other, to derogate from the actual existence of the Three Blessed Persons.[2] Of course, a solution of the perplexity may be found, if it be admitted that the *finite* individuality which supplies our

[1] "Cur ergo non hæc tria simul unam personam dicimus, sicut unam essentiam et unum Deum, sed tres dicimus personas, cum tres deos aut tres essentias non dicamus, nisi volumus vel unum aliquod vocabulum servire huic significationi, qua intelligitur Trinitas," &c.—*S. Aug. de Trin.* vii. 11.

[2] "Quæsivit quid tria dicerent: et dixit substantias sive personas, quibus nominibus non diversitatem intelligi voluit, sed singularitatem noluit," &c.—*S. Aug. de Trin.* vii. 9.

standard, is no adequate measure of the *infinite*. To the Infinite and Absolute Being must be ascribed an individuality of His own, which is above our thought; and on the same principle there may exist some other than that limited and relative personality, by which each man is divided from all connatural substances. But those who deny that anything is told us respecting the Godhead, which our present powers are unable to harmonize, must choose one side or other of the difficulty. Both they cannot adopt, without such contradiction in terms as would be to affirm an untruth. But what is the Catholic course, as it was explained in ancient times, and is still maintained in all Churches of the Saints? Neither is one of these alternatives affirmed nor the other.[1] For no attempt is made to explain the nature of the Divine Being. Since Revelation is assumed to be the entrance of Divine realities into this lower world, it is not supposed that human conceptions can give them adequate expression.[2] The Church does not aim, therefore, at such logical completeness on this subject as may be required from those who consider that everything is brought down to the level of their faculties. She is content to state that the Supreme Being is one in some true and real sense. For this is revealed as the original law of God's nature. Such is the doctrine of the Unity in Trinity. On the other hand, the Church teaches that in the Blessed Trinity are Three Persons. In neither case does she

[1] "Ut, quia in deitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti *nec singularitas est nec diversitas cogitanda*, vera Unitas et vera Trinitas possit quidem mente simul sentiri, sed non possit ore simul proferri."—*S. Leo adversus Eutych.*

"Timuit dicere Tres essentias, ne intelligeretur in illa summa æqualitate ulla diversitas. Rursus non esse tria quædam non poterat dicere, quod Sabellius quia dixit, in hæresim lapsus est."—*S. Aug. de Trin.* vii. 9.

[2] "Conveniens est ut hoc nomen (persona) de Deo dicatur; non tamen eodem modo, quo dicitur de creaturis, sed excellentiori modo."—*Summa Theol.* i. 29, 3.

"All these expressions resolve themselves into the original mystery of the Holy Trinity, that Person and Individuum are not equivalent terms, and we understand them neither more nor less than we understand it." *Note on St. Athanasius's Select Treatises: Oxford Library of the Fathers,* vol. viii. p. 155.

affirm that the principle of existence which belongs to the Supreme Being is identical with that which we call personality in mankind, or that our consciousness of our own being qualifies us to fathom the depths of that Being which is Infinite. But that the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity have a real existence in themselves—that in the Deity there is an original, objective triplicity, independently of us, and of the world of creation—she grounds on the declarations of Holy Writ. And this is the mystery of the Trinity in Unity.

These two, then, are the starting-points from which we must proceed; and the firm reception of both of them maintains the reality of our belief in God. It supplies a guard against those assaults which are made on either side, in the attempt to explain what is inexplicable. Such explanations are plausible enough when viewed in relation to either of these truths singly, but they invariably fail when we attempt to apply the theory which has been framed with a view to one, to the elucidation of the other. It matters not whether they begin with the Three Persons in the Blessed Godhead, or with the Unity of Deity at large. In the first case, the separate existence of different Persons is seen to consist readily enough with unity of nature. Peter, James, and John were three persons; but they shared in that human nature which was common to them all. But such a mode of accounting for the existence of the Blessed Persons in the Deity is inconsistent with the other side of the mystery; for it is compatible with Polytheism; it does not recognize the Unity of God. It is at variance, therefore, with the whole teaching of the Old Testament, and has in consequence been formally condemned as heretical.[1] The same will be found to be the result if we begin with the other side of the doctrine. That a single being might display him-

[1] The notion of the Abbot Joachim that the Unity of Persons in the Blessed Trinity was only like that which binds together different men, was censured by the Fourth Lateran Council. According to him, it was an "unitas collectiva et similitudinaria, quemadmodum dicuntur multi homines unus populus."—*Hard.* vol. vii. p. 18.

self under various characters, as he came into relation to various parties, is intelligible enough. Cicero speaks of himself when practising for the bar as discharging the part of three persons—the plaintiff, the judge, and the accused. Here again is another explanation, which would maintain the Unity of the Supreme Being, and yet render the existence of different Persons intelligible. But as the previous solution offends against the Unity of the Godhead, so does this against the reality of the Three Blessed Persons which constitute it. That which is essential to their reality—that which constitutes them real Persons, and not a mere fictitious representation, is that the characteristic conditions which mark their divergency should lie in the eternal nature of Godhead itself, and not in any relation to the surrounding world of Creation. For otherwise, why should the Persons in the Blessed Godhead be limited to Three? Why should not their number be unbounded? And the consequence of explaining away the actual Being of the Blessed Three, would be to destroy the possibility of the Incarnation, and the reality of the Mediation of Christ. The Three Persons therefore in the Blessed Trinity have something more than a mere relationary existence dependent on external things. They have a necessary Being, dependent on that eternal law by which the Godhead exists. As it would be impossible for Deity to be other than holy and just—these being primary conditions of its nature—so to exist in Three Persons is the law of Godhead. Such is the barrier which the Personal Being of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, opposes to all Sabellian deductions from the Unity of the Supreme Being; and thus are we turned back again to that unfathomable mystery of the Holy Trinity which is revealed.

These are the two principles by whose firm maintenance the Christian mind is restrained from error on this cardinal article of our faith. "In all things the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped." The reception of the first secures us against Polytheism; a barren Deism is excluded

by the second. The former error, at least in its avowed form, is at present to be little apprehended. The only popular shape which it assumes is that Pantheistic adoration of all existing powers, which excludes the action of any moral Ruler. For the worship of many gods is rejected by the reason of the age; and its inconsistency with revealed truth is indelibly impressed on the whole system of the Old Testament. The more dangerous error is to be found on the other side, in that surrender of the Personal reality of the Blessed Three, which results from an exclusive regard to the truth of the Divine Unity. The Unity of the Divine Nature is a doctrine so true, simple, and important—it has such strong hold on our nature, and is so forcibly recommended to us in ancient Scripture, that it naturally overbears any antagonistic principle. To this circumstance is owing the popular tendency of the day to an unconscious Sabellianism. Men construct their notion of the Three Blessed Persons on the principle of a logical consistency with that system of interdependence, of which the Unity of the Godhead is the basis. So that the prevalent misconceptions show the natural tendency of the mind to harmonize the whole scheme of the Trinity with this central idea. And if this error was guarded against in early days, it was because the whole system of the Church was in continual antagonism against it. For, starting from the fact of our Lord's Incarnation, having His worship as its first object, the support of His true objective reality as its primary function, the Church's system as it traced its way upwards towards the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, was occupied all along in making good the other side of the alternative, and in maintaining the true existence of its Incarnate Head. The vindication of His worship had led it to those deep mysteries which it was found necessary to explore; and this side, therefore, of the doctrine, it was impossible that it should abandon. So that while the reaction against heathenism was a sufficient guarantee that the Unity of the Godhead would never be surrendered, the opposite truth—the real existence of the Ever-Blessed Three—was no less

deeply rooted in the instinct of Christian piety. For the existence of the Eternal Son, as a separate Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity, was linked by inevitable sequence to that manifestation of God in the flesh which was the first starting-point for the religious mind of the Church. From the single fact of the worship of Christ as very God, are we carried back by necessary connexion to His personal indwelling in the bosom of Eternal Godhead. And for this reason it is that those who either openly or unconsciously are betrayed into Sabellian doctrines cannot receive the truth of Our Lord's Incarnation in its fulness. For they are deprived of the substratum on which it must rest—the existence, namely, of an Eternal Father of the Eternal Son. The one of these notions is of necessity implied in the other. "As the Father always existed," says St. Athanasius, "His image must have had the same co-eternal being. For God's image is not something which is delineated externally to Himself, but God Himself is the parent of that image, in which His pleasure is to contemplate Himself." "Was there ever a time, then, in which the Father did not contemplate Himself in His own image? Was there ever a time in which it was not His pleasure thus to contemplate Himself?" [1]

The relation then between the two Persons is, that as one is *ever Son*, so is the other *ever Father*.[2] As the one therefore is eternal, so is the other. "Such as is the Father Himself, such is His image." [3] And this likeness is not a mere matter of appointment, as the heathen set up idols to represent their gods. The Arians could allow the worship of Christ, as being authorized to represent God; [4] but this was to degrade Him into the region of

[1] *S. Ath. contra Arian.* i. 20.

[2] "Cum enim Deus et omnipotens et æternus creditur Pater, consempiternus eidem Filius demonstratur.' —*S. Leo in Eutych.* Ep. xxiv. 2.

[3] *S. Ath.*, u. s.

[4] On this ground it is that Archbishop Whately justifies the worship of Christ. "We differ from the worshippers of any mere man, whether an impostor, as Mahomet, for instance, or a Saint, as Moses or Peter; or of a graven image, or a fire, or of anything else that they have set up for themselves; —we differ from them I say in this, the essential circumstance, that

created beings, and to forget that He was in Himself and by nature the "brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His Person." And, except through Him whose office is to reveal Him, is the Father invisible and unapproached. For He is not only "the King invisible," but who "dwelleth in the light which nothing can approach unto." Scripture, says Tertullian, points out the difference between the Persons of the Godhead, "by discriminating between the one which is visible and the one which is invisible." For though "the Son regarded as God, as the Word, and as a Spirit, is in His nature invisible, yet He manifested Himself even before He took our flesh." So that "the Father is invisible, the Son visible."[1] Whether this be the real distinction between these two Blessed Persons or not, the writer who makes it must have fully recognized the fact, that notwithstanding the oneness of their nature, they are personally distinct. Now the reality of their Personal distinction is the material point; and that it does not depend only on the fact of their being revealed, but is essential, primary, archetypal. For it lies in the nature of the Trinity itself, antecedent to its relation to any created substance. It was not that the Son was a name which the Godhead bore for a time, in place of bearing the name of Father—as though for the purposes of creation or government it displayed itself in various characters—but the two titles imply a real co-existence of discriminated Persons, and "though God had never seen fit to make things created, yet the Word would not the less have been with God, and the Father in Him."[2]

Now such real diversity of Persons it is which is a necessary

their worship is unauthorized, presumptuous, and vain, while ours is divinely appointed."—*Whately's Sermons* [1835], p. 53.

"If any one should choose, instead of looking to common usage, to turn to the strict etymological sense of the word, 'Idolater,' and to ask whether we are or are not 'worshippers of an image,' we ought without hesitation to say that we are.—We worship God in His beloved Son Jesus Christ."—*Ibid.* p. 52.

[1] *Tert. adv. Praxeam*, sec. 14, vide *S. Ath. contra Arian.* i. 6. "But according to His Divine nature the Son is invisible." Vide S. Aug. *Ep.* 147, 48; *Ep.* 148, 10; *De Trinit.* i. 11; *Petavius de Trin.* viii. 2, 4, and 9.

[2] *S. Ath. contra Arian.* ii. 31.

preliminary to the Incarnation of Christ. This circumstance is suggested in a well-known letter of St. Augustine. "How," it had been asked him, "could the Lord and Ruler of the world endure the prison of the Virgin's womb?"—"How could *He* lie concealed in the narrow limits of infancy, for whom the universe is not sufficiently extensive? *The Ruler of all things leaves His own abode, and He who has care of the whole world transfers Himself into one little body.*"[1] St. Augustine replies by distinguishing between things material and immaterial; maintaining that the conditions which are applicable to the one cannot be transferred to the other. "It is not true that God is so infused into flesh, that He has abandoned the care of the world's government." And then he adds, that "The Word of God has not put off His eternity, nor abated His power, nor abandoned the world's government, nor departed from the Father's bosom, from the secret place, where He is with Him and in Him."[2] In this last circumstance lies the explanation of those passages of Holy Writ which speak of God as really united to manhood, and which yet deal with the Father's Personality as though unaffected by the event. For it was the Word which was made flesh, but not the Father or the Holy Ghost. It was not the whole Trinity[3] which was personally united to our nature. Those who lose sight of this circumstance cannot possibly give its due weight to the reality of that union which was effected between God and man. For either they must esteem what was united to manhood in Christ to be an inferior or delegated Deity, which is the Arian side of the dilemma, or else they must look upon the Union as partial and transitory—as an indwelling, not an impersonation—as the gift to manhood of such power and presence as was bestowed in their measure on the Prophets. Without the belief in a diversity of Persons, more than this could not be supposed, without entrenching too far on the self-existent and indivisible Unity of God. Now this last, which is the Sabellian alternative,

[1] S. Aug. *Ep.* cxxxv. sec. 2. [2] Ibid. *Ep.* cxxxvii. sec. 4, 6.
[3] Damasc. *De Fid. Orth.* iii. 6.

is as plain a denial of Our Lord's Human, as the Arian hypothesis of His Divine nature. Those who receive it cannot believe that really and permanently God is man, and man God. This is why a demonstration of the truth and completeness of Our Lord's Human nature, as evidenced by the existence of His man's soul, was found so effectual a means (*vid.* p. 104) of releasing Beryllus from Sabellian errors. The full admission of Christ's manhood, in those who do not suppose that personally He was a mere man, implies that there must be some Personality in the Blessed Trinity, other than that of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, on which this abiding and complete Union may be dependent. Not, of course, that what is Human can be so completely identified with what is Divine as to be its measure or limit: even when Godhead and manhood were so intimately allied as to make up one Person, the Finite nature was not lost, but comprehended, in the Infinite. But by admitting the permanence of Christ's lower nature, we are driven to find something which shall discriminate His Divine Personality in Deity itself. And since such discriminating circumstances cannot be drawn from His relation to the creatures; since then He would either be a creature Himself, or else not truly other than the Father, from whom He is personally discriminated; therefore it must be by some relation within Deity itself that the distinction must be maintained. And therefore it must be an eternal relation—a relation in the nature of things—self-originating, primary, archetypal.

The Eternal Son then it was, who in the fulness of time became man for our sakes. "The Word was made flesh." Having been the Eternal Son, He became the Incarnate Son also. Even according to His man's nature, He was not, properly speaking, a creature, though consisting of created elements; for whereas all creation was His own work, He Himself was moulded according to His manhood, out of the created substance which He had made, by the informing power of the Holy Ghost.[1]

[1] "Nec ab eo genitus sed creatus."—*Paschas. De Spir. Sanct.* i. 2. So the ancient Creed, which is preserved among the documents of the Council

Not as though He had not been the Son previous to the existence of any created intelligences: nor yet as though to send Him had been merely to bestow Sonship upon some inferior nature, which God had first created. For "what was called His mission was the uniting the Godhead to manhood, that the Invisible nature might be discerned by man through the Visible."[1] And His name of Son is not derived from His gracious Advent, but His Advent was consequent on those discriminating characteristics in the Godhead, which are referred to when He is called the Eternal Son. For it must be borne in mind, as St. Basil[2] reminds us, that earth and things human are borrowed and derivative; that which is self-existent and primary being those heavenly realities from which things worldly have their origin. And Holy Scripture refers us to the fact, that it was by Him who was the "appointed heir of all things" that the "worlds were made;" and likewise, that it was "after His likeness," who was "the express image of the Father," that man had been created—as being the reason, why, to the gracious condescension of this especial Person in the Blessed Trinity, we are indebted for the economy of our salvation. For "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him." "He came unto His own." "The true light which lighteth every man was coming into the world." For as Hooker observes, "it seemeth a thing unconsonant that the world should honour any other as the Saviour, but Him whom it honoureth as the Creator."[3] "And as God's wisdom had been pleased to humble itself to the creatures, and to give them the impress and semblance of its image,[4] so does He expressly declare in the Book of Proverbs, 'My delights were with the sons of men.'"[5] So that "it could be no other Person of the Deity who conversed with men on earth in ancient

of Ephesus: "ὅλον ἄκτισον καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἄκτισον."—*Harduin*, i. p. 1639. But vide also *S. Ath. c. Ar.* ii. 45, 47, with the notes to the Oxford Translation.

[1] *S. Ath. c. Arian.* iv. 36.
[2] *S. Basil. adv. Eunomium*, ii. 23.
[3] *Eccl. Pol.* v, 51, 3.
[4] *S. Ath. contra Arian.* ii. 78.
[5] Proverbs viii. 31.

times, but the Word, who was afterwards to become flesh."[1] Thus was there a peculiar adaptation for the work of man's regeneration in Him after whose pattern man had been originally created. For whatsoever God was going to make in the creatures, existed beforehand in the Word, and could not have existed in things below had it not been previously in the Word."[2]

It is from some natural law therefore of His Divine Being, not from a mere temporary economy, and in reference to things created, that the Son is the image and representative of the Father. For "the substance of God, with the property *to be of none*, doth make the Person of the Father; the very self-same substance in number, with this property, *to be of the Father*, maketh the Person of the Son."[4] So that the distinction between them, of which the work of redemption is an effect, did not arise from that work of mercy, but lay in their own Being, the worlds being yet unbuilt. Neither was it merely the result of the Father's will, by which He commissioned an inferior being to undertake what He designed to be performed, for this would be only to fall back again upon what has already been negatived, and to make the Son's being depend upon the works which He was raised up to discharge. Whereas, He represents the Father as being His equal. "Such as is the Father Himself, such is His image."[5] "He is God *from* God, Light *from* Light, Very God *from* Very God."[6] And on this depends that higher notion of Divine character which has been communicated to mankind by the Gospel of Christ. For mounting up from that which has been taught us by the natural representative and true image of Godhead, we may attain to heights which the weakness of humanity had been unable to reach. This it is which first

[1] *Tertull. adv. Praxeam*, 16. [2] S. Aug. *on Psalm* xliv. 5.

[3] Hebrews i. 3 would be more correctly rendered "the express image of His substance." It is the Father's Godhead, not his Paternity, of which the Son is the image.

[4] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 51, 1. [5] *S. Ath. Or. contra Arian.* i. 20.

[6] "Ὁ Πατὴρ ῥίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος."—*S. Bas. Hom. c.* 27, *Sabell. vide Def. Fid. Nic.* iv. 1, 7.

raises us above those carnal notions of Deity which Grecian fable had built upon the more splendid vices of corrupted man. And one effectual manner, in which the early Church witnessed to that higher ideal, under which the Godhead had been exhibited by its true Pattern-Image, was to give the first lesson to mankind of universal love. The acts of mercy showed by Christians to the indigent heathen in time of public distress are recorded [1] to have been one main circumstance which inclined the world to the general acceptance of Christianity. For "by this shall all men know that ye are My Disciples, if ye have love one to another." And, in like manner, is there a truth as well as dignity given to our conceptions, which the grander mysticism of the East could not attain. For so long as Infinity alone was supposed the essence of Deity, there was no communing with anything that could represent its nature, and bring home its greatness to our thoughts. But the acts, not less than the communications of Him who is "the express Image of His Father's Person," have taught us that the moral attributes of Godhead make up the true "Brightness of its Glory." Therefore can we say in the sublime words of Anselm, "I ask not, Lord, to attain to Thy height, with which my understanding is not compatible, but I desire in some measure to understand Thy truth, which my heart believes and *loves*." [2] For as it was under this aspect that the Godhead has been manifested by the Eternal Son, so is it revealed respecting the self-existent Father also, that the characteristic essence of His Being is Love. And this leads on to that further consideration of the Coinherence of the Three Persons in the Godhead, by which the mystery of the Trinity in Unity is distinguished, as well from the mixture which is produced by the material union of different bodies, as from the mere harmony which attends the moral union of different minds. In this fact probably, if we may presume to judge respecting such a mystery, lies the secret which reconciles the existence of Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity with the Unity of that nature

[1] Eusebius, *Hist.* vii. 22, and ix. 8. [2] *Proslogion*, i.

which is common to them all. "For how," asks St. Cyril, "can there be Unity in Godhead, if each Person is separated by a perfect individuality; and the name of God is given to each Person, without community of nature and substantial inherence in the others?"[1] But that which was declared to us by Our Blessed Lord was the fact that He "is in the bosom of the Father" "The Father therefore is in the Son, and the Son in Him. They both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both of Them. The Son in the Father, as light in that light out of which it floweth without separation; the Father in the Son, as light in that light which it causeth and leaveth not."[2] On this subject Athanasius refers to the words of Dionysius of Rome (in the third century), that "with the God of the Universe the Divine Word is one, and the Holy Ghost has in the same its resort and converse."[3] And the same truth seems to have been aimed at in a fragment of St. Irenæus, in which the Son is said to be "the measure of the Father." Inasmuch as there is one nature in the Divine Three, while by personal difference they are really discriminated, therefore, by mutual indwelling and coinherence, they are to one another an object of contemplation, and, if it may be so expressed, "a place of abode."[4] To this it is then that Our Lord refers, when He says that "I am in the Father, and the Father in Me;" and this is "the glory which He had with" the Father "before the world was."[5] And on the other hand, thus it was that He was the "beloved Son," in whom the Father was "well pleased." "For how should He be truly a Father," asks St. Hilary, "except by contemplating His own substance as it existed in His Son?"[6] And so says Athanasius, that as "the Son is the subject of the Father's pleasure, so is the Father the subject of the Son's love, pleasure, and honour."[7] Let this thought be coupled with what has before been noticed

[1] St. Cyril, as cited by Petavius *De Trinit.* iv. 16, 10.
[2] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 56, 2. [3] *De Decretis Nic. Syn.* 26.
[4] "Filius locus est Patris, sicut et Pater locus est Filii."—*Jerome in Ezec.* iii. 12. [5] *St. John* xvii. 5. [6] *De Trinit.* ii. 3.
[7] *Orat. contra Arian.* iii. 66.

of the nature of the Godhead, and we may discern how the eternal Sabbath of Divine self-contemplation enhances our conception of the moral Attributes of God. For it does not lead to a mere Brahminical dream of never-ending forgetfulness, but it sets forth the Eternal Godhead as having, in its own self-existent harmony, the most perfect object of thought and of affection. "The essential happiness of God consists in the knowledge and love of Himself; and this reflected perfectly from one Person of the Godhead to another."[1] And hence can it dispense with such lower objects of interest as are supplied to inferior beings by the material world. For "I am in the Father and the Father in Me" speaks an eternal relation; it shows that the Word was not dependent on our Being; that "He was not brought into being for us, but that we were brought into being for Him."[2] And on this topic Athanasius enlarges in the very striking passage in which he comments on the declaration concerning Our Lord in the Book of Proverbs: "For the knowledge of the Father, which is by the Son, and that of the Son which is by the Father, is all one, and the Father delights in Him; and with the same joy the Son delights in the Father, saying, 'I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.' This shows that the Son is not something foreign, but proper to the Father's substance. For He did not come into existence on our account, nor was He made out of nothing; for it was not from any external source that God procured to Himself a cause of rejoicing, but He is set forth as being proper to God and like Him. When could it be then that the Father rejoiced not? And if He always rejoiced, than the cause of His rejoicing must have had an eternal existence. And wherein does the Father rejoice, save by beholding Himself in His proper image—that is, His Word? And if after the world was made, He rejoiced also in the sons of men, as the Proverbs witness, yet this comes to the same thing. For this delight was not from any joy which was additional to

[1] Leslie's *Socinian Controversy*, Dialogue I. vii. p. 236.
[2] *S. Ath. contra Arian.* iv. 12.

His nature, but He rejoiced at seeing that the works were created after His own image. So that His own image was here too the cause of the Divine joy. And how again does the Son rejoice, save as beholding Himself in His Father; for this is the meaning of His saying, 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father, and I am in My Father, and My Father in Me.'"[1]

Thus have we been led on then to recognize in the Divine nature that which is at once the highest object of contemplation and the primary source of being. For since God is the last of these, He must plainly be the first likewise. And whatever is real and self-existent must be found in Him. Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα. Our notions therefore of things human, and the conceptions of mankind, are rather to be measured by this standard, than to measure it. For "this is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." As the doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, has been shown to be essential to the development of that first movement of piety, whereby the Son of Man was reverenced by those who had been admitted to His knowledge, so will all higher branches of truth be found to rest on this reality. When men attempt, therefore, as was done by Plato of old, and has been done with less excuse by the thinkers of modern Germany, to invent an intellectual Theogony out of their own conceptions, the attempt is so far useful, as it is looked upon as an illustration only and shadow of those great realities, which exist around and above us, and by Revelation have been made known to our minds. In this view, the intellectual schemes which have been put forth by a series of German writers from Kant to Hegel are not without interest. The last of them has carried further the notion of his predecessors, and given shape to the idea which is thrown out by an ancient Father: "The Monad moving forth originally into Duality,[2] at length rested in the Trinity."[3] No doubt this

[1] *Orat. contra Arian.* ii. 82, vol. i. p. 549.

[2] This notion is enlarged upon by Leslie—*Socinian Controversy*, the First Dialogue, viii. 1.

[3] Dorner, vol. i. p. 904.

thought is capable of wide development, and since man was originally created after his Maker's image, there will be some appetency to admit those truths, which have their original in Him. But all speculations on the Godhead proceed on a fallacious ground, if they rest only on human conceptions, and on the requirements of man's mind. For neither is this our sole means of knowledge, nor in it consists that ultimate object after which we seek. What were this but to "worship and serve the creature more than the Creator?" Unless the reality and original of all things be fixed in the actual Being of the self-existent Godhead, there can be no basis on which to ground our thoughts. The real existence of the Ever-Blessed Trinity must be received as before all creation, and as underlying all knowledge. The mystery of its Sacred Persons must be the beginning of our thoughts.[1] And this it is which Revelation discloses to us. "For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all One, the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. And in this Trinity none is afore or after other—none is greater or less than another; but the whole Three Persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal. So that in all things the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped."

CHAPTER VI.

THE UNITY OF PERSON BETWEEN GOD THE WORD AND THE SON OF MAN.

Our Lord's character has now been considered under its two aspects: first, as the Son of Man; and secondly, as God the Word, "who is over all blessed for ever." To complete this

[1] "In illa Trinitate summa origo est rerum omnium, et perfectissima pulchritudo et beatissima delectatio."—*S. Augustine De Trin.* vi. 12.

part of the subject it is essential to establish a third point, which is no less necessary than the reality of each of Our Lord's natures, namely, that they were truly joined together. For "although He be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ."

This truth is as plainly demanded by the requirements of Christian piety as any which have preceded it. For since Our Lord is the link between heaven and earth—the true Jacob's ladder whereon the angels of God ascended and descended; since our salvation rests on the fact that He who is consubstantial with the Father is also consubstantial with His brethren—a sufficient advocate because He is God, a sympathetic advocate because He is flesh: since this is the manner in which the higher being was brought down to the lower, and the nature which was pure and holy entered as a renovating principle into the corrupted line of Adam's race—therefore, unless the actual personal unity of Our Lord's two natures is held as fast as the reality of each, we may find ourselves unexpectedly deprived of that which seemed to be most surely established. This feeling of the infinite importance of Our Lord's Mediation, has led the Church to exercise such scrupulous watchfulness against all theories which break that golden chain by which God and man are bound together. For though that which hazards the real Unity of the two natures in Christ may seem at first sight to be only an explanation, or a dislike of explaining, as the case may be; yet further consideration shows it to be fatal to the very existence of Godliness, of which the truth that the same Person is both God and man forms the very foundation.

This fact it is, then, which must now be considered, and its reality depends plainly on the two following conditions:—first, that there should be a true union of Godhead and manhood in Christ; and secondly, that the mode of union should be such that neither nature should be destroyed in the conjunction. The consideration of which subject will lead to the further inquiry, how each nature is affected by the union, and what preparation

is thereby made for that work of Christ which both as God and man it has been His pleasure to undertake. For this work depends in truth upon both His natures, and upon that peculiar constitution of each of which its union with the other is the cause: inasmuch as no part of that wonderful mystery of Incarnation, to which He graciously submitted for the sake of man, is without its influence on our welfare.

Now, in considering the real union of the Divine and Human natures in Christ, it will be best, perhaps, to follow the course which was marked out in the last Chapter; to inquire what were the actual steps by which God's Providence secured for this doctrine its full statement and perfect appreciation, and what were the individual errors by which it was hazarded. For the history of the three first centuries has been shown to be a witness that the detailed statements of the Creeds respecting the Trinity in Unity are not refinements engrafted by men's subtilty on the simplicity of Scripture, but that they are only the complete expression of that august truth which was enshrined in the pious veneration of the first Disciples. The facts of the case show that nothing less than their plenary acceptance can either save us from fatal errors, or do justice to the fulness of those communications which were made to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost. And the same may be said respecting the doctrine which is now to be considered—the Real Union of Natures in Christ. For it will be found that there was one specific period of the Church's history, when it was brought forward with peculiar prominence, because then it was especially hazarded; and as the two first General Councils were engaged in maintaining the truth of those natures which were present in Christ, so was it the no less necessary task of the two next (at Ephesus and Chalcedon) to maintain the reality of their union. It has been pointed out how the doctrine of Our Lord's Divine nature was witnessed both at Nice and Constantinople, and how it was illustrated by the great Athanasius. The primary truth of the Ever-Blessed Trinity was shown by him

not only to be involved in the words of Scripture, but to be demanded by the requirements of the Christian mind. Unless the Word or Eternal Son existed really as a separate Person in the glorious Godhead, neither could Christ be the proper object of worship, nor could the redemption of mankind be truly effected. But the existence of the Eternal Word cannot be really admitted, unless that view and those relations of the sacred objects of our worship which we call the Trinity in Unity are taken as the beginning of our knowledge and basis of our thoughts.

It has been stated how this doctrine was opposed in the second century by those who maintained that man's nature could not be united to God; and who, therefore, like the Ebionites, denied the Godhead—or like the Gnostics, the manhood of Christ. Again, it has been shown how in the following ages the controversy rose to a higher level—how it was transferred from the human to the Divine nature, and what arguments were derived from the Unity of the Godhead against the presence of Deity in Christ. In this period, too, the Arian school came to the conclusion that in Christ there was no real Godhead, while the reality of His manhood was explained away by the Sabellians. "These mists," as Hooker expresses it, though dispelled by "the light of the Nicene Council," yet returned in the fifth century under that different form which must now be considered. For though Our Lord had been recognized as both God and man, yet it was found possible to introduce such misconceptions respecting the manner in which these two natures were united, as in reality to deny what in profession was admitted. Through which process we fall back again upon the very same alternative which has before been exhibited; so that while the Nestorian theory issues in the conclusion that the Son of Man was not God, His manhood was on the other hand destroyed by the Eutychians. It was essential, therefore, for the satisfaction of Christian piety, that this part also of the truth should be firmly established, and it is

an instance of that Providential government by which the Great Head has provided for His people, that the question was decided by the voice of two of those General Synods, which have always been allowed to express the collective judgment of the Church, and which carry with them therefore all the weight, whether of testimony or authority, which belongs to the Body of Christ.

It was not denied by Nestorius that Christ might be called both God and man; his error was the denial that these two natures were really united in one Person, and the supposition that they dwelt only by inhabitation, and (as it were) by vicinity in the same mortal frame. The Son of God, therefore, and the Son of Man, were looked upon by him as being in reality two Beings, who were linked together in amity, because the higher had condescended to make His dwelling in the body of the lower. What led Nestorius to this conclusion, seems to have been the confusion of Man's personality[1] with His nature, and his incapacity to perceive that there are parts of their constitution which men share in common, while to every individual there is something peculiar to himself. He was a victim to that spurious sort of Nominalism, which asserts, that because men are able by abstraction to class things together, which have no real connexion, therefore there can be no such common entity as nature in the creations of God (*vide* pp. 30, 31). This error has already been noticed; it has been shown that in all those creatures which God has endowed either with animal or vegetable life, one condition of that life is a mysterious principle of combination which is called their nature. Its existence may be tested by those singular laws which govern reproduction, and which lead to the perpetual re-appearance of the same type in successive generations. There is something in the simplest vegetable which the most perfect imitation of its parts is unable to supply. But from age to age the innumerable classes of organized beings go on transmitting the impress which was

[1] Vide Paschas. *De Spiritu Sancto*, Lib. II. cap. iv, *Bib. Pat.* viii. 815.

bestowed upon them by the Creator. And it is unphilosophical to deny the existence of a principle, of which we see such obvious effects, because our modes of analysis are not subtile enough to discover on what it is dependent. Let the principles of Nominalism, therefore, be confined to their proper ground—the abstractions namely of men, which are connected together merely in our own thoughts—but let us not attempt to break the chain, by which God's Providence has united the varying classes of His organized works. This was the error of Nestorius, and by this speculation was he led to the fearful result of denying in fact the reality of Our Lord's sacrifice, and of the Christian covenant of grace. And it was the truth of these doctrines which the Church Catholic vindicated against him. "What leads to the mistake of the heretics," says Damascene, "is that they confound substance with person." And the ground of his objecting to what might seem only a philosophical error is, that he might assert that "the union" of two natures in Christ "is substantial, by which," he says, "I mean true, and not merely imaginary."[1] Now it is plain, that unless the Son of God and the Son of Man were really and not merely by profession one, those things which were done by the one could not truly be participated by the other. In the sufferings then, which were borne for us by the one, the other would have no proper share; nor would the inferior person participate really in the glory of the superior. And more than this, since the Son of Man must first be a complete Person in Himself, and then be joined to the Son of God, it could not be anything which pertained to our nature at large, but this single individual, who was so highly favoured. "The Word (saith St. John) was made flesh and dwelt *in us*." The Evangelist useth the plural number, men for manhood, *us* for the nature whereof we consist, even as the Apostle, denying the assumption of *Angelical nature*, saith likewise in the plural number, "He took not *Angels*, but the seed of Abraham." It pleased not the Word or Wisdom of God

[1] *De Fid. Orth.* iii. 3.

to take to itself some one person among men, for then should that one have been advanced, which was assumed, and no more; but Wisdom, to the end she might save many, built her house of that nature which is common unto all; she made not *this or that man* her habitation, but dwelt *in us*."[1] "For He took my whole nature upon Him, and in the fulness of Godhead was united to it all, that the whole might obtain salvation. For if there were anything which He did not take upon Him, it would have no part in His saving power."[2]

Such was the Church's faith, therefore, as put forward in the Anathemas of Cyril,[3] which were adopted by the Third General Council at Ephesus. It is not built upon any system or school of philosophy, but aims only at maintaining what had been asserted from the first, that the same Person Jesus Christ was truly God and truly man also. But it may be asked, can a point so intricate be really necessary, or is it possible that the poor of Christ's flock, who form its most cherished portion, should be able to thread the mazes of so subtile a controversy? Doubtless they cannot. And yet the truth which is thus set forth is no less necessary to them than to the great and noble, nor are any

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 52, 3.

[2] *Greg. Naz. et Cyril in Damasc. de Fide Orthod.* iii. 6.

[3] "The Anathemas of St. Cyril were read at the General Council of Ephesus [*Harduin*, i. 1395], and, like his other statements, received a general approbation; they were more formally sanctioned at the Fifth General Council at Constantinople, A.D. 553."—[*Harduin*, iii. 194.] His opposition to Nestorianism led St. Cyril to the repeated employment of such statements as the following: "The Body of Christ is life-giving, because it is the temple and dwelling-place of that living God, the Word," &c.—Vol. iv. 602 [in Joann.]. "Because He made that Body which was taken of the pure Virgin His own, He rendered it life-giving, and very naturally, for it is the Body of that Life, which is the parent of life to all things."—*De recta Fide*, c. 56, 5, part ii. 177.

St. Cyril is spoken of by Dr. Jackson as generally acknowledged to be "the fittest umpire" in a controversy respecting the Real Presence. If his statements are true—and they were countenanced by the universal Church as represented by the Third General Council—it follows that any school, which denies the Humanity of the Mediator to be the medium through which Divine gifts are communicated to mankind (and such is the error of all Rationalists), is theologically allied either to Nestorianism, or to Deism, in which Nestorianism results.

persons better prepared to accept it to the saving of their souls. For even as our merciful Saviour, in the days of His flesh, while the covetous Pharisees derided, was ministered to by the poor women of Galilee, so are none more ready than the poor of this world to trust in Christ as their present God, and yet to look to the perpetual sympathy of Him who in His poverty was their brother. But how is this lesson to be taught them? A means has been appointed for bringing it before their minds, which, while open to the observation of all, yet raises their thoughts at once to the most momentous mysteries of our Lord's nature. That means is the Holy Communion[1]—a rite which is not less fitted than in the days of St. Irenæus to teach men that Our Lord is God, since He can make earthly instruments answer a heavenly purpose, and that He is man also, since it is His Body and Blood which He gives as our spiritual food in that holy feast. The Sacraments have been from the first the natural out-work of the Doctrine of the Incarnation; and from recognizing a true presence of Christ in these ordinances, in which He communicates Himself both as God and man, are we carried on to a genuine belief, that two natures are really united in His adorable Person. For if Godhead and Manhood are truly united in Christ, both must co-operate in those offices which He discharges towards mankind. To this truth many are unwilling to listen, because they suppose that the efficacy of Christ's manhood can mean only the natural efficacy of His material body. And this induces unbelief respecting the supernatural efficacy of that manhood of Christ which is the principle of regeneration to all His brethren. Now, that the Holy Communion must in some way or other be connected with the manhood of Christ is manifest, since but for His taking our flesh, body and blood

[1] "As there is a recapitulation of all in heaven and earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation of all in Christ in the Holy Sacrament. You may see it clearly; there is in Christ the Word Eternal, for things in heaven; there is also flesh, for things on earth. Semblably the Sacrament consisteth of a heavenly, and of a terrene part."—*Bishop Andrews's Sixteenth Sermon on the Nativity.*

could not in anywise have been conditions of His nature. To declare Christ's real presence therefore by spiritual power in the Holy Communion, is the simplest method of reminding men that the one of Our Lord's natures is modified and advanced by the other. For that which renders the manhood of Christ a fountain of graces—that which gives it glory, power, and wisdom—which makes it the source of life—for "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself"—all this is effected by that hypostatical union in Christ Our Lord, which brings the Divine into such close union with the Human nature. To believe then in this mysterious union in Christ our Lord, it is not needful that men should be conversant with the errors of the Nestorian theory, but only that they receive what the Catechism teaches, that while the benefit of the Lord's Supper is that "strengthening and refreshing of our souls," which can be bestowed only through the Divine power of the Saviour, the inward part or thing signified is as plainly that which is connected with Christ's manhood, the "Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Such is the manner in which this great Doctrine addresses itself to simple minds, who will be found not less ready than the educated to believe the truth of an event, the manner of which no intellect is able to divine. For the mode in which Godhead and Manhood are united in Christ is like the conjunction of soul and body in man—as impossible to explain as to deny. And the Creed, therefore, contents itself with paralleling the two together; not as though they were exactly alike, but as though they must both be referred to the class of things, the manner of which is beyond mortal comprehension: "For as the body and soul is one man, so God and man is one Christ." Now, this union cannot take place by the mixing together of two natures so as to form a third, for then the result would neither be God nor man, but some compound nature; it must be the conjunction of one personality with two natures. Christ is "one

not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person." Now, since personality is plainly one and indivisible, it must pertain originally to one of these natures, unless, which was far otherwise, they had been in their origin contemporaneous; and it could not therefore be equally related to each of them. For though personality has been shown by Butler[1] and Berkeley[2] to be a primary principle, not resolvable into mere consciousness; yet consciousness is so intimately allied with its actings, that since unity is the very essence of the one, it must plainly be a condition of the other. In which, then, of His two natures did the Personality of Christ Our Lord originally reside? Plainly in His Godhead. For He Himself refers to its actings, before His human nature was assumed: "Before Abraham was I am." Let the foundation of the hypostatic union be laid in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Personality of Christ is comprehended in that of the Eternal Son. "Christ is a Person Divine, because He is *personally* the Son of God; human, because He hath really the *nature* of the children of men."[3] The Word was already in existence as a Person, before He "was made flesh."[4] For the manhood of Christ did not assume the Godhead, but the Godhead of the Word assumed the human nature.[5] Christ "was one not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God."

And yet it is not meant that two unconnected natures, continuing in themselves wholly unrelated, were joined together by some third substance, namely, the Personality of Christ. For though what we call nature is some mysterious law which we observe to bind together many individuals, yet it is only in individuals that it has its being, and personality is that in which it subsists. Though personality and nature may be conceived of apart, yet they are not things which in act can be separated from one

[1] Appendix to the *Analogy*.
[2] *The Minute Philosopher*, Dial. vii. sec. 11.
[3] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 53, 3.
[4] "Verbum, prius quam caro fuerit, non erat Christus."—*Fulgent. Ferrand, de Incarnatione*, c. 10.
[5] Gennadius in Suicer, i. p. 358.

another; inasmuch as the one cannot exist except in and through the other. We cannot, indeed, attribute to Christ a human personality distinct from His Divine, because this would be to deny His Unity, and thus to relapse into the heresy of Nestorius; nor yet, in speaking of His Divine Personality, can we undertake to limit that infinite existence of which we have only a partial knowledge, and to affirm that it is strictly identical with that which our experience enables us to call Personality among men. But Our Lord's own sayings[1] justify the assertion, that His Divine Personality is so far identical with that with which we are conversant, as to comprehend and discharge its functions. So that we may affirm, even of Our Lord's human nature, that it never existed except in a Personal relation.[2] If Christ had not a human Person, it was "because the Personal Being, which the Son of God already had, suffered not the substance to be personal which He took; although, together with the nature which He had, the nature also which He took continueth."[3] Now, of two natures thus manifested in the same Person, by that law of their constitution whereby their existence is identical with their inherence in one individual being, it is impossible to suppose that the one is not in some degree affected by the other. For in its relation to His Divine nature, the Personality of Christ continues no other than it was before the world began. And therefore since His other and inferior nature has been attached by Personal propriety to Himself, this union of Godhead and Manhood in one Person must have involved intimate action of the one nature upon the other. So that when it is said that Godhead and Manhood were joined together, it is plainly meant that the two natures were not only allied, in that they belonged to the same person, but that they were closely united the one to the other. And this is the great truth which Revelation discloses to us. For its purpose is to

[1] St. John viii. 18.

[2] "Natura quippe nostra non sic assumpta est ut prius creata, post assumeretur; sed ut ipsa assumptione crearetur."—*S. Leo*, Ep. 25, 3.

[3] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 52, 3.

declare a way by which God and man may be joined together. Now, if this had happened only by the accidental assigning of two unconnected natures to one common possessor, what benefit had it been to mankind at large? There needed such union, that between Godhead and Manhood there should be a permanent alliance. That as God mercifully condescended to become man, so might man be truly God. And in consequence of this great event, as the whole Trinity condescended to participate by interest and sympathy[1] in that being which was taken by the Eternal Son into co-partnership with His own, so was there a channel opened to the whole race of man, through regeneration and grace, for communion with God. There flowed forth into the lower nature of the Mediator such streams of grace, as sufficed to enrich the whole generation[2] of His brethren. The alliance of the elder brother ennobled the whole household from which His kindred was derived.

Now, if it be asked what were the particular effects which resulted to each nature in Christ from its union with the other, it is plain that to the superior nature there could accrue no proper alteration, seeing that to be unalterable belongs to the very nature of God. All, therefore, which can be attributed in this respect to Christ's Godhead is, that its Will was, by union with man's nature in His one person, to exercise some new manner of sympathy with that being with which it was personally associated. And in this the whole glorious Trinity is declared to have co-operated. For "He that loveth Me, shall be loved of My Father."[3] And "the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved Me, and have believed that I came out from God."[4] And therefore, was "God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself."[5] But if it be asked, on the other hand, what effects

[1] *Damasc. de Fid. Orth.* 3, 6.

[2] "Se totum toti Adæ immiscuit, vita mortuo, ut eum servaret, in eum totum penetrans cui unitus erat, sicut anima magni corporis, totum animans, et toti vitam impartiens."—*Anast. Sinaita, Or.* 3, *Bib. Max. Patr.* 9, 932. Vid. Fulg. *Ferrand. de Incarnatione*, c. vii. Galland. xi. 235.

[3] St. John xiv. 21. [4] St. John xvi. 27. [5] 2 Cor. v. 19.

were produced by personal union with Deity upon man's nature, we are assured that gifts greater than tongue can utter or heart conceive were bestowed upon it. For this is the very meeting-place of heaven and earth, the union of glory and humiliation; herein the two worlds of the infinite and the finite touch upon one another; by this we see what God can bestow, and of what man is susceptible. Surely the very comprehension of man is incapable of enlarging itself to such conceptions. His ear cannot drink in the intensity of the angelic harmony, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men." With this subject does even the fulness of Holy Scripture overflow. Those who do not discern it are untaught in "the whole counsel of God." To put it aside as an unnecessary portion of our faith would be, like Esau, to despise our birthright. For through this event it is, that the gifts of regeneration and grace have found their way into the progeny of fallen Adam. On this circumstance depends the truth, that salvation rests on the supernatural gift of God, and not on the self-dependent exertions of human excellence. For this is the very promise which was made to Abraham, that in his seed should all the families of the earth be blessed. Their common nature was to be exalted through Him who sanctified humanity by being born into the world, as by His death He redeemed it. For this was the true Son of David, of whom God spake by the Psalmist: "I will make Him My first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." His kingdom had been beheld in vision by Daniel, when "one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom—His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."[1] And if it be asked when He was anointed to this kingly office, this likewise is declared in Scripture: "The[2] Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be

[1] Daniel vii. 13, 14. [2] St. Luke i. 35, 32, 33.

born of thee shall be called the Son of God." "And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and of His kingdom there shall be no end." It was when the Divine came in contact with the human nature, that there were bestowed upon the latter those gifts of grace, by reason whereof it is declared that "God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows."[1] For the anointing was the presence of that "spirit and power' which dwelt in Christ "without measure."[2] And thus "Christ Himself," says Damascene, "anointed Himself. As God He anointed His body with Deity; as Man He was the anointed One. For He was at once both God and Man. And the Godhead was the unction of the Manhood."[3] "The gift whereby God hath made Christ a fountain of life, is that conjunction of the nature of God with the nature of man in the Person of Christ, which gift (saith Christ to the woman of Samaria), if thou didst know, and in that respect understand who it is which asketh water of thee, thou wouldest ask of Him, that He might give thee living water."[4]

Now, it is no diminution of the reality of this gift, that during Our Lord's sojourn upon earth it was so imperfectly apprehended. For the season was not yet arrived when He had "taken" to Him His "great power, and had reigned."[5] For after that He had been "found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death." As His Incarnation was the humiliation of His Godhead, so was His death the humiliation of His earthly nature. For He consented to serve like Jacob for His hire, and His hire was the Church, which He purchased with His own blood. And on His humiliation did there follow the exalting of His man's nature. For, "being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him."[6] "Wherefore God also

[1] Hebrews i. 9. [2] Acts x. 38; St. John iii. 34.
[3] *De Fide Orthod.* iii. 3, p. 206. Vide Vigilius, c. Eutych. iv. 5; S. Aug. de Trin. xv. 46.
[4] *Eccles. Polity*, v. 54, 3. [5] Revelation xi. 17. [6] Heb. v. 9.

hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth."[1] And "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Angels that He might taste death for every man, crowned through the suffering of death with glory and honour."[2] And thus is He made "the Head of the body, the Church: the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence."[3] But all this is somewhat different from that exaltation of man's nature which is now in question. The present subject is not the glory which Christ gained for man's nature by His obedience, but that which He conferred upon it by His Incarnation. For by that act were Godhead and manhood brought into contact with one another. The question, therefore, is not what was gained for man's nature by Christ's obedience: but of what it was made capable by His coming in the flesh. For from this capacity did all His acts as man result. Adam's nature, even had it retained its early purity, had been incompetent to support them. They were something for which the genius of Isaiah or the love of St. John would not have sufficed. They showed the natural exaltation of that humanity with which Godhead had been personally united. For, first all power had been bestowed upon it: "For it pleased the Father that in Him all fulness should dwell." And "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand."[4] And secondly, in Him "were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."[5] For He was "the power of God and the Wisdom of God."[6] Even in His humanity He was "an object of worship to the hosts of heaven."[7] Though He was crucified, yet He was "the Lord of Glory."[8] And when He somewhat withdrew the veil, in which He commonly shrouded His lustre,

[1] Phil. ii. 9. [2] Heb. ii. 9.
[3] Colossians i. 18: *vide* also Eph. i. 21; 1 Peter iii. 22.
[4] St. John iii. 35; xvii. 2; St. Matt. xi. 27.
[5] Col. ii. 3. [6] 1 Cor. i. 24. [7] Heb. i. 6. [8] 1 Cor. ii. 8.

"His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light."[1]

And by reason hereof there was conferred as a gift upon the man Jesus Christ, that quickening power which pertained to His Godhead by nature.[2] For "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He *given* to the Son to have life in Himself."[3] And so did He declare when addressing the Father as Mediator for His brethren: "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him."[4] Thus was there bestowed upon what was human in Him such living energy, as was evidenced while He was upon earth, when "there went virtue out of Him, and healed them all."[5] So that it became that "quickening spirit"[6] which is able to bestow a new life on the progeny of Adam, and that "bread" of life, "which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die."[7] All these are indications of Divine powers bestowed upon the Manhood of Christ, through its union with the Eternal Word; and we witness our belief in their permanent connection with it, when it is through "His body"[8] that we seek to profit by their presence. For so much has been bestowed upon the manhood through its union in one Person with the Godhead of Christ. Thus has the one nature received by gift what the other had by inheritance. And the only limit which can be assigned to their perfect union is, that the properties of each are not so transferred as to destroy the

[1] St. Matt. xvii. 2.

[2] "Quicquid in tempore accepit Christus, secundum hominem accepit, cui quæ non habuit conferuntur."—*S. Leo*, Ep. 97, 7.

[3] St. John v. 26. [4] St. John xvii. 2. [5] St. Luke vi. 19.

[6] 1 Cor. xv. 45. [7] St. John vi. 50.

[8] "Si quis non confitetur carnem Domini vivificatricem esse, tanquam propriam ipsius Dei Verbi . . . . . quia facta est propria Verbi Dei, cui omnia vivificare possibile est; anathema esto." This is the Eleventh of St. Cyril's Anathemas (Harduin's Conc. vol. i. p. 1294); and in defence of it he adds: "Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ζωὴ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγος, ζωοποιὸν ἀπέφηνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα. ταύτῃ τοι γέγονεν ἡμῖν εὐλογία ζωοποιός."—Contra Orient. ad Anath. 11, p. 192.

"Est enim hæc caro, quia est filii Dei, sic et sanguis ζωοποιός, ut D. Cyrillus contra Nestorium pulchre explicat."—*Buceri Scrip. Ang.* p. 473.

reality of either. For "the glory of the Godhead, which dwelleth bodily in Christ, is infinite. But it is not communicated to Christ's human body according to its infinity; the communication of it, or the glory communicated, is created, and therefore finite."[1] "As the Son of God is now in the association of flesh, no alteration thereby accruing to the nature of God; so neither are the *properties of man's nature* in the person of Christ by force and virtue of the same conjunction so much altered, as not to stay within those limits which our substance is bordered withal."[2]

Now this was the very point which was maintained against Eutyches by the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon. His error arose from the very same misconception which lay at the root of the speculations of Nestorius. Since it was clear that Christ was one determinate Person, performing all which He did with the unity of one single consciousness, it followed, if nature and person are of necessity the same, that He must have but one nature also. This result might be brought about either by the swallowing up of one nature in the other, or by the coalition of both in something compounded of the two. In the latter case, both natures would be extinguished, and Christ would neither be God nor man; in the former case, one nature would perish, and either the Godhead or the Manhood would be wanting. The notion of Eutyches was that the Manhood was lost in the Godhead. But this, just as much as the theory of the Nestorians, was fatal to the reality of our oneness with Christ. For it was in reality to revive that opinion of the Docetæ, which had been abandoned in name. Our Lord's sufferings and death would thus become only a figurative representation, and He would have no proper co-partnership in man's trials. So that here again the truth of Our Lord's Being was what the Church Catholic maintained. And its vindication was the purpose of all that was stated respecting His nature. This

[1] Jackson's Works, Book xi. c. 3, vol. x. p. 31.
[2] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 54, 5.

it was, no doubt, which made His descent into hell a point of sufficient moment to be introduced as a constituent Article into the Creed. For it sets forth the reality of that human soul which is a specific part of man's nature. "The true Doctrine of the Incarnation against all the enemies thereof, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and the like, was generally expressed by declaring the unity of the soul of Christ [1] really present in hell, and the unity of His Body at the same time really present in the grave." [2] The truth of these assertions was virtually involved in the statement which had been received from the beginning, that Christ was truly and in all respects man, even in the Article of His death. For it belongs to man's body to rest in the grave, and to his soul to visit the unknown abode of the departed. And such an entrance of Christ into the unseen world had been especially predicted by David, as contemporaneous with the deposition of His body in the grave. "He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His *soul* was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption." [3] Thus did the Church's testimony respecting Christ supply the explanation of St. Peter's words, that Christ preached after His death to the spirits who were "in safe keeping;" [4] to those, it must be supposed, among the antediluvian Patriarchs, who, having been disobedient in slighting Noah's warning, were yet not so finally impenitent as to be altogether cast away.

The confession of faith therefore which was put forth at Chalcedon, was only designed to guard the reality of those individual points of Christian belief, which were declared in the express words of Scripture, and which had been enshrined in

[1] This action of our Lord's human soul, when separate from His Body, is one of the most satisfactory arguments against that opinion of the sleep of the soul between death and judgment, which is built upon the material notion that the soul cannot act without the body. Since our Lord was the type of man's nature, the certainty of the soul's separate action in His case implies its possibility in ours.

[2] Pearson on the Creed, Art. v. [3] Acts ii. 31.

[4] ἐν φυλακῇ does not in itself imply a place of punishment, but of detention." 1 Pet. iii. 19.

the devout affection of the Apostolic age. The Church had been brought under the guidance of God's Spirit to such ripeness of judgment as "by reason of use" to discern the full meaning of various truths, which had been revealed at once to her inspired founders. "Following therefore the holy Fathers," said the six hundred Bishops at Chalcedon, "we agree unanimously to set forth one and the same Jesus Christ to be perfect God and perfect Man, without confusion and without division."[1] This was the work which was completed by what Hooker terms the "four most famous ancient General Councils." The question which subsequently arose, whether there was one Will or two in Christ, was in reality involved in what was already decided. For since *to will* belongs to the completeness of man's nature, had not this part of our being been taken, Our Lord would not have been that perfect man which He consented to become for our salvation. The single point, therefore, if traced into its results, would have vitiated all which had been before effected. And therefore the Monothelites, as they were called, were in truth only a section of the Monophysites: to deny Our Lord's two wills was in reality to deny one of His natures. Yet it is remarkable that while the heretical parties, by which the truth of either of Our Lord's natures was directly denied, were of the most variable and transient nature, either dying out altogether after a few years, or else passing into some other form of heresy; those which were built on errors respecting the manner of their conjunction have been most settled and lasting, and continue to have their place among the Oriental Churches even to this very day. The reasons appear to be, first, that errors of this last sort do not lie so near the beginning of the system of Christianity as immediately to discover their consequences; and secondly, that they do not destroy the belief of that union with Christ on which all external Church coherence is dependent. For faith in Christ, as shown in the last chapter, requires, as a pre-requisite, belief in the existence of

[1] Actio V. Harduin's *Conc.* ii. p. 455.

the Eternal Son as a separate Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity. If this be wanting, there is no opening for the permanent Incarnation of the Son of God. And, on the other hand, when Our Lord's manhood is lost sight of, the permanent union of mankind under Him, as its new head, has nothing to stand upon. These errors, therefore, prevent the formation of any abiding party, because they destroy in its beginning the very ground of the faith—the union, namely, between God and man; whereas errors respecting the nature of that union itself, however fatal, have yet their termination in themselves, and rather benumb and deaden belief than directly destroy it. Whatsoever separates men indeed from actual union with Christ, must be fatal to that inward life which can result only from the gift of an external blessing; and such seems to have been the result with those bodies by which the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies have severally been adopted; their protracted existence has been marked by a perpetual decay, which has witnessed to the viciousness of their original constitution.

The faith of the Church Catholic, on the other hand, sets forth each part of the mystery of the Incarnation in its completeness. It begins with the real existence of the Eternal Son, as a true Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity; not a work of creation, nor owing His being to the Father's will, but "begotten of the Father before all worlds," by some eternal and mysterious law of necessary derivation. This is the foundation of the Doctrine of the Incarnation; and its superstructure is that this same Being, when He took flesh, continued to be "perfect God," but became likewise "perfect man," possessing "a reasonable soul and human flesh." The first of these is the Doctrine of the Trinity; the second, that of the hypostatical [or personal] union. Both are necessary parts in a belief in the Incarnation of Our Lord. Both were fully present, doubtless, to the minds of the inspired Apostles. But it was only through the gradual growth of the Church's mind, and by the teaching of the Holy Ghost, that their full relations and mutual

interdependence were seen to be involved in the individual statements of Scripture concerning the Son of God. And here, then, this survey of Our Lord's nature may terminate. Let it be observed only, that by this union with Deity there has been conferred upon our whole race the greatest honour of which created substance is susceptible. For that manhood should thus have been taken into Godhead, shows that there was between them such compatibility and accordance as stamps the lower nature with that truth which belongs to the very essence of the higher. It has sometimes been disputed, whether the decisions of reason and the decrees of conscience have any proper authority, or have only such semblance of reality as belongs to our transitory state. That they should have been present in Him in whom they were matured, purified, exalted, and should thus have harmonized with those perfect lines of truth which radiate from the throne of God, is the best evidence of their reality. For had God been pleased to employ the organs of some inferior animal, as is once recorded in Holy Writ, for the expression of His will, such nature had not been susceptible of that personal union with Him which is set forth in the Incarnation of Christ. But that man was found susceptible of it—that his faculties required to be exalted, not destroyed—shows that the traces of that image in which he was first created had not been obliterated from his soul.[1] And thus does the Incarnation, more than aught beside, witness to the reality of that objective system of belief which it has pleased the All-Wise to reveal to His reasonable creatures.

[1] "Rectissime dicitur homo factus ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei: non enim aliter incommutabilem veritatem posset mente conspicere."—*S. Aug. de vera Relig.* sect. 44.

CHAPTER VII.

OUR LORD'S MEDIATION THE CONSEQUENCE OF HIS INCARNATION.

HITHERTO the inquiry has respected Our Lord's nature: we have seen that He is both God and man—"the seed of David according to the flesh,' and likewise "the Son of God with power." More than this, it has been shown that He is the Pattern Man, the second Adam, the representative of humanity; and again, that He is the "Eternal Son," the coequal participator of self-existent Godhead, of one substance with that Almighty Father from whom He is personally distinct. Finally, it has been shown that these two natures are so truly joined together in the one Person of Christ Our Lord, that while continuing to be what they were, they are yet each influenced the one by the other.

The second part of the subject proposed was the effect which has been produced upon the condition of mankind by Our Lord's Incarnation. This, in other words, is the Doctrine of Our Lord's *Mediation*. For His name of Mediator is not bestowed by reason of any work in which He was occasionally or partially occupied; it sets forth that office, which resulted from the permanent union in one person of God and Man. For the benefits which He bestows upon man's nature result from His being the link which binds it to Deity. The salvation of Adam's race depends upon the influence of that higher nature which has been introduced into it from above. This gift was first bestowed upon humanity in the Person of Christ, that from Him it might afterwards be extended in degree to all His brethren.[1] Before considering the course through which these

[1] "Since sure it is that the Son of God is made the Son of man, it is not incredible but that the sons of men may be made the sons of God."—

benefits have been dispensed, it will be necessary to state to what heads they may severally be referred, and what is the exact nature of that office of *mediation* through which they are conferred upon us.

I. By Our Lord's Mediation, then, is meant that He is not *a* Mediator, but *the* Mediator between God and man. This is the meaning of St. Paul's assertion: "There is one God, and *one* Mediator between God and men."[1] The expression is equivalent to an assertion that there is one only. And herein lies the distinction between the Christian Church and those who, without adopting her whole belief, profess faith in Our Lord. For Our Lord might be a Divine Person raised up to teach—He might be a perfect example—He might be the medium through which gifts of grace were bestowed, and pardon of sins conferred on men; and yet there might be other channels opened through whom the Godhead might bestow its blessings, and other persons who might be its intermediate ministers. The Arians do not seem to have generally rejected the Doctrine of Our Lord's Atonement; nor need it be rejected even by Socinians; though they are unlikely to attach importance to a doctrine, the true grounds whereof they have abandoned. Again, the Mahometans universally allow Christ to have been *a* Mediator between God and man, so that He is one among those through faith in whom they hope to be justified. But the Christian faith is, that Christ is not *a* Mediator, one out of many, but *the* Mediator—the real bond by which Godhead and manhood are united. And this arises not from any technical and artificial appointment; He bears this name because He *is*[2] what it expresses. His title follows from His nature, as effect from cause, as consequent from antecedent. He truly is what no other is, or can be

Bishop Andrews's Sixth Sermon on the Nativity. "Filius hominis est factus, ut nos filii Dei esse possimus."—*S. Leo*, Ser. xxv. 2. Vide Fulgentius, *De Incarnatione*, Bib. Pat. Max. ix. v. 310.

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

[2] "Officium Mediatoris, nisi ex veritate naturæ carnis, quam ex nobis habuit, implere non potuit, quoniam per ipsam inter Deum et homines medius apparuit."—*Vigil. c. Eutych.* v. 15.

beside Him, the Pattern Man, the second Adam; therefore no other can take His place among the generations of mankind. And again, He alone is fitted to represent the Father, for "no man hath ascended up into heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." The blessing which is to regenerate man's nature must have an external source, and it cannot be obtained, therefore, except through one who is a real channel of intercourse with God. This is what we speak of then as Our Lord's Mediation. We speak of an office which belongs to Him by nature, and results from the constitution of His Being. For this cause the Son of God consented to become the Son of Man: "When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb." Moses acted as mediator, Christ became one.

II. And this, doubtless, is the reason why the universal Church, acting under the guidance of God's Spirit, has set forth as the distinguishing criteria of belief, not the mere acts of Our Lord, but those conditions of His character on which their value is dependent. It has sometimes been asked why Our Lord's Atonement is not inserted in the Creed in such express words as is His Incarnation. The reason is, that Our Lord's Atonement may be admitted in words, although those who use them attach no Christian sense to the doctrine which they acknowledge; whereas if the Doctrine of Our Lord's Incarnation is once truly accepted, His Mediation follows as its necessary result. So that the Church was guided by Divine Wisdom to make this Article of Our Lord's real nature the criterion of her belief, the "Articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ:" it holds a leading place in the profession which in all ages has been required at Baptism; and the early believers gave a token of their reverence when, on declaring that He "was made man," they were wont, with one consent, to bow the knee and worship.

III. It must be observed, then, that the very essence of this office is, that all functions which are discharged on God's part

towards man, or on man's part towards God, are gathered together in His single Person. In this respect was Joseph His type in the prison, as well as upon his seat of power, inasmuch as "whatsoever they did there, he was the doer of it." He is the sole channel of all which is done by God towards man, or man towards God, under the Christian covenant. For He is the one only Mediator who unites both. He is the sole channel through whom the graces of the new dispensation are bestowed by God upon mankind. Therefore, He said, when promising the gift of the Holy Ghost: "He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you."[1] And so, likewise, is He the only medium through whom our prayers can ascend to God, for "no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." This is the place wherein heaven and earth are connected; the bridge which joins them together. He is "the door,"[2] "the way, the truth, and the life."[3]

IV. Again, the office of Mediator, which is thus undertaken by Our Lord, is not a transitory, but an enduring one. It lasts as long as the Gospel kingdom. It was not merely discharged while He was upon earth, and resigned so soon as He had founded the Church, and commissioned His Apostles: He continues "Head over all things to the Church;"[4] and as He now bears the office of regency, so does that of Judge await Him at the Great Day. For the Father "hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man."[5] This is part of *His* office, who is God's perfect representative towards mankind; and meantime, He acts perpetually on behalf of mankind towards God: "He ever liveth to make intercession for them."[6] For He is present continually in heaven according to that human nature whereby He is the "Lamb that was slain;"[7] while in earth also He is present through His power, for "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."[8] What may

[1] St. John xvi. 14. [2] St. John x. 9. [3] St. John xiv. 6.
[4] Eph. i. 22. [5] St. John v. 27. [6] Heb. vii. 25.
[7] Rev. v. 12. [8] St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

happen in these respects in another state of things we know not. "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." "Then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."[1] The authority which the Mediator now possesses, as Incarnate Son by gift, may then perhaps be merged in that which He possessed before all worlds, as only-begotten Son by nature.[2] But till then, "all power is *given* to" Him "in heaven and in earth;"[3] "and He is the Head of the Body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead."[4]

V. And yet since Our Lord's Mediation depended upon His man's nature, and since that man's nature was capable of being perfected, He must plainly have entered upon it by degrees. This it is which enables us to consider it in its several parts, and to trace those different stages into which it was divided. The acts of Godhead are in themselves eternal, like the nature of that Infinite Being, with whom is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." It is only on man, to whom succession is the law of life, and whose endurance is measured out by time, that successive events impress their several impulses. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world."[5] It is because manhood, therefore, has been united to Godhead in Our Lord's Person, that His acts can be arranged according to those conditions of time, by which man's nature is limited. In the counsels of God, Our Lord's acts were ever present; He was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."[6] So far as His death contributed to the purposes of mercy, it might ever equally be taken account of. But since He was made "perfect" as a man "through sufferings;"[7] since His work, that is, was

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

[2] Our Lord's office as Priest, says St. Austin, will then be merged in His office as Divine ruler: "ut in quantum Deus est cum illo nos subjectos habeat, in quantum sacerdos nobiscum illi subjectus sit."—*De Trin.* i. 20.

[3] St. Matt. xxviii. 18. [4] Col. i. 18. [5] Acts xv. 18.

[6] Rev. xiii. 8. [7] Heb. ii. 10.

provided for by the growth of His body and the preparation of His mind—so that "being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him"[1]—therefore His Mediation may be referred to different periods, and considered under those several conditions, in which He successively displayed Himself. Now, that which made the most marked difference in His human character was His Ascension into glory. For then was the obedience of His earthly life rewarded by a heavenly crown. To this He directed the attention of the Jews, as that which would render His man's nature the source of graces to His brethren: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?"[2] Therefore, "when He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."[3] The consummation of His resurrection was His session at the right hand of God. The interval was a transition state, when He was neither present carnally, as among the Jewish multitudes, nor, as in the ordinances of the Church, by spiritual power: "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father."[4] Thus is this event the dividing epoch in Our Lord's history. So that His acts of Mediation may be conveniently divided into those which preceded, and those which followed, His Ascension into Heaven.

CHAPTER VIII.

OUR LORD'S ACTS OF MEDIATION PREVIOUSLY TO HIS ASCENSION; OR HIS TEACHING, HIS EXAMPLE, AND HIS SACRIFICE.

SINCE Our Lord's Mediation was the natural result of that twofold nature in which He was manifest among men, it implies plainly a twofold action, as its relation towards man is considered, or its relation towards God. For to man He was

[1] Heb. v. 9.
[2] St. John vi. 62.
[3] Ephes. iv. 8.
[4] St. John xx. 17.

manifested as a teacher and an example, while He offered to God the perfect sacrifice of our redemption.

I. And, first, to consider Him in His relation towards man. To detail at all His actions on this side of His character would far exceed the limits of the present volume, since it would be to state at large the whole lesson which is exhibited by the Evangelists. The life of Christ, as Bishop Taylor has shown us, is the best channel for communicating the precepts of the Gospel. In this place it is enough to refer in general to God's goodness, in having bestowed such a medium of instruction upon men. For hereby reason has its employment, and love its pattern. Thus are all parts of our nature called into exercise, and the understanding learns to assent to that which the will is to perform. Through the instructions which Our Lord bestowed, we gain that gradual ascent from earthly things to heavenly, whereby He conducted His Disciples, and through them all subsequent generations, towards that higher world, with which Himself was familiar. And then in the more exalted communications which followed His Resurrection, did He open the understandings of His Disciples to "things pertaining to the kingdom of God."[1] These they afterwards unfolded at large through the teaching of the Spirit. Meanwhile their affections were no less elevated than their reason, and the Being, before whose majesty they trembled, they learned to love. For He who was the true Pattern Man, "the chiefest among ten thousand," "altogether lovely,"[2] submitted to be "heard" and "seen" with their eyes, and "looked upon."[3]

Such was the peculiar privilege of those who were the first to profit by that great event whereby God and man were brought together. And thus has the blessing been extended to all generations of mankind. For through the teaching of the Gospels have all nations been made conscious of those deep mysteries of which man's nature is susceptible. The cold, selfish, isolated, grovelling spirit, which bound all men to party, race, or language,

[1] Acts i. 3. [2] Sol. Song v. 10, 16. [3] 1 John i. 1.

and, still more, which centred each man's thoughts in his own private ends, have yielded in a measure to that more generous and exalted feeling, which the Pattern Man exhibited upon earth. Here is that in which all men have a common interest —to which all men's sympathy responds alike—which all must admire, love, seek, cherish—which they discern to contain the real secret of their happiness and object of their being. Thus is man's life made capable of higher ends—his race is discerned to be the depository of nobler principles—he is compelled to allow the supremacy of better maxims, and the wisdom of rules, by which his own practice is too often condemned. How many have prayed for their murderers, now that the Pattern Man has enabled our hearts to feel what, but for His example, might have been for ever hidden in the undeveloped capacities of man's nature—that revenge is less noble than forgiveness. Thus has He set forth the perfect type of manhood, and through the example of the elder brother, the lineaments of truth may be discerned even in the corrupted nature of His brethren.

And further, by enshrining these truths in that one book, which has thus become the common standard of all civilized nations, literature has in some sort been made catholic, and art been made divine; so that they are no longer limited to individual races, but esteemed the common property of every child of Adam; and again, that their noblest subjects are felt to rest no longer on mere beauty of form or strength of conception, but to depend on that moral greatness, which, once exhibited in its perfection upon earth, can never cease to be regarded as the true ideal of human excellence.

II. But it is when we turn from Our Lord's actings towards men, and consider the part which He discharged towards God, that we approach the most wonderful side of His Mediation. And here we must expect that our reason will speedily be left behind by the greatness of the subject, since what we consider is the function which was performed towards the Everlasting Father by Him, who, His equal by nature, had consented to

become the representative of mankind. His sayings, too, to His brethren are given to us in abundance; of His words to His eternal Father but a few occasional specimens are recorded in Holy Writ. A few expressions occur at different periods of His ministry, and one remarkable chapter (St. John xvii.) which declares its completion. These all reveal the same truth respecting Our Lord's relation to the Father, that its single characteristic was Obedience. Thus did the Pattern Man render exactly that service, in which all His brethren had been wanting. "Submission to the will of God," says Butler, "may be said to be the whole of religion." And disobedience is the very condition of our sin. Now, Our Lord declares the fulfilment of His Father's will to have been the very purpose of His being: "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."[1] Or again: "What shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour."[2] And once more, even in His hour of agony did He exclaim, "Nevertheless, not My will, but Thine be done."[3] This lesson of "obedience," it is declared in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Our Lord "learned."[4] Everything else was communicated to His man's soul by way of inspiration from His higher nature. This thing only it was essential that He should acquire through the perfect road of experience. In its complete mastery lay the signal excellence of His man's soul. The two wills which dwelt within Him moved together in perfect and unalterable harmony. What the Divine will prescribed, the human will completely responded to: "For I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me."[5] And "therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received from My Father."[6]

[1] St. John xvii. 4. [2] St. John xii. 27. [3] St. Luke xxii. 42.
[4] Hebrews v. 8. [5] St. John vi. 38. [6] St. John x. 18.

The life of the Pattern Man, then, may be said to have been a continual setting forth of that duty of Obedience, which His brethren, the children of Adam, had failed to render. He appeared once for all as the representative of mankind, and was obedient: "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me) to do Thy will, O God."[1] This it is which He exhibited from first to last—from His conception in the womb until He was buried in the earth. In all parts of life—in childhood, youth, and ripeness of years—as member of a family or a single worshipper—in solitude or in company—in the wilderness or the city—in the shop or the temple—in honour or contempt—in penury or at feasts—His "meat" was "to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work."[2] Yet there remained one thing still greater: for all mortal pangs are gathered together in that last and most fearful one, the tearing asunder of soul and body in death. Now, from this trial also Our Lord did not shrink. He was "obedient unto death."[3] And in this part of His course lie those especial circumstances which are declared in Holy Scripture to be the causes of man's redemption. For though He is said in general to be the "last Adam," the "second Man,"[4] yet it is with His Death and Passion that His sacrifice for sin is expressly connected. For "we[5] have redemption through His blood," says the Apostle twice over, "the forgiveness of sins." He has "made peace through the blood of His cross,"[6] and He came "to give His life a ransom instead of many."[7]

This offering of Himself on behalf of man was the true sacrifice, which all the sacrifices of the Ancient Law served to introduce. Not that our Lord's offering was built upon them; that it pleased God merely to give His sanction to an ancient usage, and to hallow it by the sacrifice of Christ. That which happened was exactly the reverse; the offerings of the Law

[1] Heb. x. 7. [2] St. John iv. 34. [3] Phil. ii. 8.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47. [5] Ephes. i. 7; Col. i. 14.
[6] Colossians i. 20. [7] St. Matt. xx. 28.

were built upon the offering of Christ; they were the type of a future reality, which cast its shadow beforehand on the Jewish nation. For all the Jewish ordinances "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle." "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."[1] How the practice first began of presenting flocks and herds as an offering to God is not recorded, though it seems most natural to attribute it to a Divine appointment; but when it was made a part of the Jewish Law, its meaning was explained to that chosen people. For while they were allowed to retain the old custom of presenting Burnt-Offerings as the expression of their piety, two especial kinds of sacrifice were added, Peace-Offerings and Sin-Offerings, as expressive of those particular relations to God, of which they were the depositories. These three species of sacrifices are described in the commencement of Leviticus. The Burnt-Offering, as the representative of piety at large, had in it some circumstances which belonged specifically to each of the others. It was an atonement,[2] like the Sin-Offering—a sweet savour,[3] like the Peace-Offering. For these are the characteristics of the two other sorts of sacrifice. The Peace-Offering typified the general duties of worship—the Sin-Offering the application for forgiveness. That which was indicative of the first, was "a sweet savour unto the Lord;"[4] that which was characteristic of the last, was first, the prohibition of frankincense,[5] with a view of preventing it from being a sweet savour;[6]

[1] Heb. viii. 5; ix. 23. [2] Lev. i. 4. [3] Lev. i. 17.
[4] Lev. iii. 5. [5] Lev. v. 11.

[6] The phrase, "sweet savour," occurs thirty-nine times in the Pentateuch, and often in such marked opposition to the Sin-Offering, as can hardly be accidental. The single apparent exception, Lev. iv. 31, may be explained by supposing that the parenthesis should be extended: an arrangement which is favoured by the repetition of the word Priest, and by the change of the tenses. "He shall take away all the fat thereof (as the fat was taken away from off the sacrifice of Peace-offerings"—vide

secondly, the burning of the beasts so offered without the camp;[1] and thirdly, the consequent defilement of the man[2] who burnt them. These circumstances indicated that the "blood" of the Sin-Offerings was "brought in to make atonement."[3] And yet the very circumstance that for legal impurities there was in each case provided a special purification, while the greater faults which burthened men's conscience, except in a few cases which might lead to social disorder,[4] were not remitted, was sufficient to suggest what was subsequently declared, that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins."[5] What these sacrifices effected, then, was to maintain for those who offered them, a title to participate in the privileges of the chosen nation; and in that collective worship, whereby it kept its hold on the true Sacrifice, which once in the fulness of time was to be offered on the Altar of the Cross. The Peace-Offering set forth man's allegiance to God when he was forgiven, and the Sin-Offering showed that forgiveness was not to be obtained through his own deserts, but by the substitution of some intermediate victim; while both together witnessed that the sacrifices of men were to be offered, not like the Burnt-Offerings of old, by each man or household for itself, but by an appointed servant of God, whom He had anointed to be Priest: "No man taketh this honour upon himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron."[6]

Now, Christ Our Lord is the one centre in which all these lines have their meeting. He is the true Peace-Offering, who "hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."[7] And He is the only effectual Sin-Offering, who, "that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate."[8] For this very

cap. iii. 3-5:—"and [*i.e.* when] the priest burnt it upon the altar a sweet savour unto the Lord), and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him."

[1] Lev. iv. 12, viii. 17; Heb. xiii. 11.
[2] Lev. xvi. 28.
[3] Lev. xvi. 27.
[4] Lev. v. 1-6; xix. 21.
[5] Heb. x. 4.
[6] Heb. v. 4.
[7] Eph. v. 2.
[8] Heb. xiii. 12.

purpose it was that He clothed Himself with a mortal body; He took that common nature which He shares with mankind that He might "have somewhat also to offer."[1] "Wherefore, when He cometh into the world, He saith, sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared[2] Me." So "that we are sanctified through offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all."[3]

Now, since this is the crisis of that great work which Christ came to perform, its groundwork must have been laid in both of His natures. Their separate action, indeed, is not now before us, but that work which He wrought as God-man by their perfect co-operation [*θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*].[4] But this may be better appreciated, if it be observed, how exactly He was fitted by the wisdom of God for the service of mercy which He discharged. So that we may look first to the Divine and then to the human side of His character, and see why this was the only real sacrifice which could be presented on man's behalf to God. For by reason of His Divine nature, had the sacrifice of Himself such intrinsic value, that the representative of mankind could offer it effectually in mediation for our race. For, from Christ's Divinity there flowed such consecrating virtue, as made Him a fitting *Priest*, and such atoning efficacy as made Him a sufficient *Victim*.

A Priest is explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to be some one "ordained for men in things pertaining to God;" his office being "to offer gifts and sacrifices."[5] And such is the origin of the word in primitive languages,[6] in which the notion of

[1] Heb. viii. 3.

[2] The quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews is from the Septuagint; the Hebrew giving "mine ears hast Thou opened." "Why," asks Tholuck, "has the translator rendered 'ears' by 'body'? If he thought that in the original a part was put for the whole, the ground of his translation was obvious. If he looked at the phrase as the Chaldean Paraphrasts, the Rabbins, and most modern interpreters, have done, he expressed the effect in place of the cause, in his translation," *i.e.*, a body was essential for that obedience which the Hebrew expresses that our Lord rendered.—*Tholuck on Hebrews* x. 5.

[3] Hebrews x. 10.

[4] Vide Damasc. *De Fide Orth.* iii. 19.

[5] Hebrews v. 1.

[6] From the verb כָּהַן to be a mediator or middle person [Gesenius], comes

the setting apart those who should act on man's behalf towards God is everywhere visible. For some peculiar sacredness seemed to be needed for the office so soon as anything of a public Ritual arose. Hence, while common worship was that of single hearths, the father of each household was its Priest; and hence the identifying of the office with that of the chief[1] in simple times. All these circumstances look to some peculiar consecration for the Priestly office. Yet where shall such be found? Who is pure enough to be Priest on behalf of his brethren? The one Mediator between God and man is plainly the only being who is capable of being Priest for fallen humanity: "For such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled." For since He is a Mediator by nature, He is by nature fitted to be Priest. For a Priest is a Mediator in action. So that Our Lord's Priesthood does not arise only from His having an offering to make on our behalf; it lies in His constitution; it is the result of that personal union which binds man to God. A Priest is consecrated, and Christ's consecration, as Damascene reminds us, was that uniting of His Divine to His human nature, whereby He was anointed the Son of God: "Christ glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest, but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." So that He who was the Pattern Man and representative of humanity, was qualified to execute the office of a Priest in and by His man's nature for His brethren of mankind.

But that the Mediator for men might act as a Priest, He must "have somewhat also to offer." And what was here which He could offer on man's behalf, which was of value before God? Plainly nothing, but that humanity of His own which He had rendered of infinite value by joining it in His own Person to the infinite. For this is the only thing pertaining to mankind,

the substantive כֹּהֵן Priest. So ἱερεὺς from ἱερὸς, sacred. Sacerdos, from sacrare, to set apart. In the Gothic of Ulphilas, Gudja is used for Priest, from Guth, God.

[1] Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos.

which, regarded in itself, is of intrinsic value. Of what value are all things which are possessed by men, whether in body or in mind? Not to mention that they are God's already, there is the further consideration that through sin they have been defiled. Now, "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord." So that no other possession or work is in it of worth offering. We cannot go too far in detracting from the value of all other works, if spoken of as an offering to God, independently of the perfect work of Christ our Saviour. It is not too much to say, that viewed as an independent sacrifice from man to God, all other works are unnecessary. For if they were necessary, no flesh could be saved. For He is the sole Mediator between God and man. What He pleads, is the sacrifice of His crucified humanity. He stands alone. The elder brother does all; His brethren do nothing.[1] He bears the burthen of all offences. He offers Himself "a ransom for all." And this ransom is of infinite value. For we were "not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold," "but with the precious blood of Christ."[2] "The Church of God" "He has purchased with His own blood." And "worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." Herein then is concentrated that service of Obedience, which Christ rendered to the Father. He "needeth not daily as those High Priests to offer up sacrifices," "for this He did once, when He offered up Himself." How far this act of sacrifice lay in the tearing asunder of soul and body, and how far in those sufferings of body and mind, which prepared for that event, it is needless to inquire. That Our Lord's trial did not arise merely from His bodily pains, but that He suffered also through those more subtile avenues, through which grief assaults the soul, is manifest. For

[1] "Acceperunt justi non dederunt coronas; et de fortitudine fidelium exempla nata sunt patientiæ, non dona justitiæ. Fides vera justificans impios et creans justos . . . . . in illo acquirit salutem, in quo solo homo se invenit innocentem."—*S. Leo, Ep.* 97, 4.

[2] 1 Peter i. 19; Acts xx. 28; Revelation v. 12.

it was during His agony in the garden, that "His sweat was as great drops of blood." This could not arise merely from the expectation of those bodily pains under which He suffered. We see in it, probably, the effect of His sustaining as our representative that burthen of God's wrath of which all mankind was deserving. For though guilt cannot be transferred, yet its punishment may be. "Now, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him."[1] "He made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin;"[2] and "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us."[3] For "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful man, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."[4] In the unknown agonies then of Our Lord's Passion, is seen the awful struggle of the infinite victim, when making compensation for the offences of a world.

Such is that sacrifice by which the Pattern Man consummated His work of Obedience. He had been "made a little lower than the Angels, that He, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man." For this purpose it was that He had become incarnate: "A body hast Thou prepared Me." And when this work was over, He could exclaim, "It is finished." It was a real work, then; not a mere compliance with the notions of men, as represented by Socinian writers, but an actual change in the position of mankind, effected through the unspeakable sufferings of its Infinite Head. Therefore did the convulsions of external nature bear witness to that mighty work which before heaven and earth was achieved. Thus was "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses." The work was not merely a change on man's part. The Divine reconciliation was the basis of his regeneration. For though God's nature be love, yet He is also "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity."[5] Therefore, "blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Now, this blessedness it is which Christ came upon earth to

[1] Isaiah liii. 5. [2] 2 Cor. v. 21. [3] Galatians iii. 13.
[4] Romans viii. 3. [5] Habak. i. 13.

bestow: "He came to give His life a ransom instead of many."[1] On Him, first of the children of Adam, could the Father look with perfect satisfaction. For the first time since the Fall could He say, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."[2] The Mediator was fitted for His work. Through the indwelling of Deity, the representative of mankind was beheld with favour.

And this leads us to the other side of Our Lord's character. What did His manhood contribute to this great work? For we still seem to need something, not indeed to show the value of this sacrifice, for of that His Deity was the only cause, since it made Him at once a fitting Priest and a sufficient Victim; but to show the participation of mankind in its saving power. For man would not have an especial interest in this work unless He who wrought it was the representative of humanity. The promise was that salvation should be wrought through the woman's seed. What was there in Christ's manhood which made His sacrifice effectual.

Now this question leads somewhat further into the inquiry, wherein lay the efficacy of Our Lord's Atonement. But if it be asked whether it was a necessary part of the counsels of God, the question is one which we are plainly incompetent to answer. In inquiring into the counsels of God, our wisdom is not to go beyond what is written. It has been asserted indeed by St. Anselm, the great founder of the scholastic philosophy, that "it is not fitting that God should forgive sins without punishment."[3] But so far as this position is grounded on *à priori* views of the Divine attributes, it is combated by later schoolmen, and it is not sanctioned by those earlier writers, to which the English Church is accustomed to refer. Neither does it rest on any direct testimony of Scripture. Looking, indeed, to the place which is occupied by Christ's Atonement in the counsels of God, and considering that His recorded acts are built upon His infinite perfections, there is a plausibility in the opinion, that what God has been pleased to do, must have been prescribed

[1] St. Matt. xx. 28. [2] St. Matt. iii. 17. [3] *Cur Deus Homo*, i. 12.

by the necessary laws of His unalterable nature. And yet perhaps, the more reverent course is to confine ourselves to the mere consideration of what He has revealed, without venturing to fathom His unsearchable counsels. When St. Athanasius therefore notices the supposition, that even without Christ's having had His dwelling among us, God might by His mere word have freed us from the curse, His objections to it are not founded upon *à priori* considerations of what was required by God's character, but upon His observed dealings in goodness and truth. "We must look," he says, "at what was beneficial for man, and not calculate only what was in the power of God."[1] And in his work on Our Lord's Incarnation, he refers us not to the abstract justice of God, but to His adherence to His revealed declarations. "For it was impossible that God should lie; and that when He had made it a law that man should die if he transgressed, He should afterwards allow His word to be vain, and man to escape death, though he were a transgressor."[2] "Whether God could have saved the world by other means than the death of Christ, consistently with the general laws of His government, is a question," says Bishop Butler,[3] "rashly determined, and perhaps with equal rashness

[1] *Or. II. Con. Arian.* sec. 68, vol. i. p. 536. "Quis negat Omnipotenti ad manum fuisse alios et alios modos nostræ redemptionis, justificationis, liberationis? . . . . Cur inquis per sanguinem, quod potuit facere per sermonem? Ipsum interroga. Mihi scire licet, quod ita; cur ita non licet."—*S. Bern. de Error. Abaelardi*, c. viii.—Vide *S. Greg. Nyssen. Cat. Orat.* sec. 32, vol. iii. p. 92.

[2] *De Incarn.* vi. vol. i. p. 52.

[3] Butler has been censured for this statement; and it has been stated, that independently of God's actual appointment, we could be sure from our abstract notions of God's justice that except through Christ's sacrifice man could not be forgiven. The only Scriptural evidence adduced for this assertion is St. Paul's statement, "that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." The interpretation, however, which it is designed to give to this verse is highly questionable. For, first, The inferential particle should be καίπερ and not καί: That He might be just, *although* the justifier of him that believeth, &c. Accordingly, one of the writers who attempts to put this meaning on the passage, renders it, "That He might be just, and *yet* the justifier," &c. Secondly, The opposition between *just* and *justifier*, evidently implies them to have a correlative meaning.

contrary ways."[1] But while abstaining from such rash conjectures, we may with confidence assert the wisdom of what it has pleased God to do, and find in His appointment a ground for admiration and thankfulness. "For what Christ does, this is what is best for mankind, and what could happen in no other manner so suitable. And what is suitable and fitting for this His providence makes preparation."[2] So that we may safely assert with Hooker, "The world's salvation was without the Incarnation of the Son of God a thing impossible; not simply impossible, but impossible, it being pre-supposed that the will of God was no otherwise to have it saved than by the death of His own Son."[3] This is not to say "what God *could* or *could not* have done;" but "what God declares He has done, that only it asserts."[4] For this is what the Angelic Song revealed: that in Christ God's glory and man's peace are united. Here, therefore, is fulfilled the prophecy of the Psalmist: "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall flourish out of the earth; and righteousness hath looked down from heaven."[5] For this was to be accomplished only through His coming, through whom the Lord has "forgiven the offence" of His "people, and covered all their sins."[6] Without pretending, therefore, to decide what abstract justice might make necessary in the eternal counsels of the Most High, we may accept with reverence the expression of His will. For we have His own assurance that "it became Him in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

But how is it that by this act God's hatred for sin is made so manifest? Wherein is the sacrifice of Our Lord such an illus-

But "*justifier* of him which believeth," plainly implies that *holiness at large* is either given or ascribed to the believer. "*Just*," therefore, must refer to God's *holiness at large*, and not merely to *distributive* justice. The passage must mean, that as God is holy, so He will give or impute the same character to the believer.

[1] *Analogy*, pt. ii. c. 5.
[2] *S. Athan. contra Arian.* ii. 68.
[3] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 51, 3.
[4] *Magee on Atonement*, note 17, vol. i. p. 176.
[5] Psalm lxxxv. 10, 11.
[6] Psalm lxxxv. 2.

tration of it? Why does His obtaining forgiveness for us set forth the Divine justice? What meeting-place is there between God's mercy and His truth? This depends plainly on the connection between Christ and mankind. It is because He pleads for a race of which He is the natural representative. He is not only mediator on God's behalf towards men, but also as man is He advocate for His brethren. He is the "one Mediator between God and men, the *Man* Christ Jesus." To be man at all would give Him an interest in our race; but that He is *The* Man, the pattern of our race, the new type on which it is founded, the second Adam—this makes Him the "one Mediator" for His brethren. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The universality of death shows that in some way we all share the consequences of Adam's sin; what peculiar fitness were there in our forgiveness through Christ, unless in a manner no less real we participated in *His* nature? For the application of this gift there needs indeed some mode of union between every individual and Christ, as real as that actual paternity by which Adam acts on all his children; and such a bond shall hereafter be shown to exist in sacramental grace and Church union. But the gift itself was purchased for humanity at large when its Head suffered in our common nature: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."[1]

The force of Our Lord's Atonement is grounded, according to these passages of Scripture, upon His being the representative of man's nature. We pretend not to conjecture whether the Divine justice might have been otherwise satisfied: it is enough that the course which it pleased God to adopt was to accept the satisfaction of one of Adam's progeny. Therefore, not only was it essential to Our Lord's Atonement that He should be clothed in "a body,"[2] but it was necessary that this body should be the body of man. He not only became flesh, but our flesh: "For-

[1] Romans v. 19. [2] Heb. x. 5.

asmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself took part of the same."[1] So that we may adopt St. Anselm's words, not grounding them, however, on abstract reasoning, but on the appointment of God. "If God had made a new man, who was not of Adam's race, he would not belong to that humanity which was born of Adam, and could not suitably satisfy for that nature to which he did not belong. For since it was right [*i.e.*, God's ordinance] that man should satisfy for man's fault, therefore he who satisfied must either be the same with the sinner, or of the same race with him."[2] But then it was not enough that He should be a mere common specimen of the race, for which He made expiation. Some persons speak of Our Lord's death as if it were a mere arbitrary substitution;[3] or as we read in history of royal intercessors, who have succeeded in begging off condemned parties with whom they had no peculiar connexion. But this is to lose sight of those especial characteristics of the Son of Man which rendered Him the natural Mediator for His brethren. If He had not been the Head[4] of our race, in whom Manhood was set

[1] Heb. ii. 14.

[2] *Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 8.

[3] "I find myself more and more attracted towards the divines who occupy themselves much in setting forth the depth and extent of sin, as a fact of human nature; though, as you may suppose, far from satisfied with the Calvinistic theories, as to the Divine purposes and the process of redemption. I do not find Tholuck as full or satisfactory as I could wish on this last matter; the Doctrine of Substitution appearing in him with too much nakedness. But I am in hopes it may be shown that the Doctrine of Substitution, when connected with the cycle of ideas relating to Christ's Headship, and to the unity of our nature as common to Him and us, issues in the one radical and comprehensive truth which man requires, and which Revelation on so many sides sets forth; and so to justify and interpret the stupendous emotions, the prodigious revolutions of character, the altered aspect of the world, and all the oracular breathings of the Spirit, which are found in connexion with the doctrines of Guilt and Atonement."—*Hare's Life of Sterling*, p. 75. O, si sic omnia!

[4] "Christo data est gratia, non solum sicut singulari personæ; sed in quantum est caput Ecclesiæ: ut scilicet ab ipso redundaret ad membra . . . Unde Christus per suam passionem non solum sibi, sed etiam omnibus membris suis meruit salutem."—*Summa Theol.* iii. Q. 48, 1. "Caput et membra sunt quasi una persona mystica: et ideo satisfactio Christi ad omnes fideles pertinet, sicut ad sua membra."—*Id.* 2.

forth in its widest and most universal character, He would not have been so exactly fitted to be that perfect sacrifice in which humanity at large finds its propitiation. A story is sometimes adduced, as illustrating Our Lord's Atonement, of a King who sacrificed one of his own eyes to save his son from the threatened penalty of blindness. The cases are not exactly analogous, since the penalty denounced was not merely the pain of present mutilation, but the bereavement of permanent blindness. But its force depends plainly on the voluntary submission of a party who by natural law was qualified to represent the offender. A parent is naturally fitted to answer for his child. For where had been the justice of the case if the King had by bribe or violence obtained some substitute with whom his son had no natural connexion? It was because Christ, therefore, was the Head and Father of man's race, that He bore in like manner not part, but all its punishment. For "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." He is "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." And that, because "He is the first-born of every creature,"[1] "the beginning of the creation of God."[2] For "if there had been anything in our nature which He did not take upon Him, it would not have been redeemed."[3]

This truth may be illustrated by a singular suggestion of St. Anselm,[4] as to the reason why the fallen Angels could not be redeemed. Mankind, he says, though consisting of many individuals, are bound together by that common tie of nature, which connects all with a general parent. So that there was room for the introduction of that nobler member into their common family, by whom compensation has been made for the deficiencies of the rest. But the Angels, though of one general nature, have no such common bond as could enable one individual to save others. Whatever may be thought of this theory, it is at all events asserted that Our Lord became incarnate in our nature, because

[1] Col. i. 15.
[2] Rev. iii. 14.
[3] Damasc. *De Fid. Orth.* vol. i. p. 212.
[4] *Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 21.

it was not Angels, but mankind that He came to save.[1] His taking our flesh is stated to be the essential preparative for His saving our nature. "He was made a little lower than the Angels, that He might taste death for every man." So that we may conclude, in the words of Dean Field, "as all fell in Adam, the root and beginning of natural being, who received the treasures of righteousness and holiness for himself, and those that by propagation were to come of him; so their restoration could not be wrought but by Him that should be the root, fountain, and beginning of supernatural and spiritual being, in whom the whole nature of mankind should be found in a more eminent sort than it was in Adam; as, indeed, it was in the second Adam, 'of whose fulness all men receive grace for grace.' And this surely was the reason, why it was no injustice in God to lay upon Him the punishments due to our sins, and why His sufferings do free us from the same."[2]

CHAPTER IX.

OF OUR LORD'S ACTS OF MEDIATION SUBSEQUENTLY TO HIS ASCENSION, AND FIRST OF HIS INTERCESSION.

Our Lord's acts of Mediation, subsequently to His Ascension, may be considered, according to the division employed in the previous Chapter, as they regard God and as they regard man. On those who share His lower nature He is ever acting by His Presence and His Grace, while towards God the Father He acts as their Mediator by His Intercession. This last office is the subject of inquiry in the present Chapter.

But before entering upon it, the writer would fain express that deepening awe with which every step in this sacred inquiry impresses his own mind. For when, leaving that higher nature

[1] Hebrews ii. 16, 17.

[2] *Field on the Church*, v. 11.

of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, and those separate parts of Our Lord's character which were first considered, we approach the application of these great realities to the salvation of mankind, the subject in reality to be contemplated is that wonderful chain by which God's goodness has united Heaven and Earth —that condescension which could stoop from the height of Heaven to the manger and the Cross—and that marvellous interdependency which can bind together the eternal nature of self-existent Godhead and the daily actions of man's common life, and make the one of these assist and be essential to the other. Who can meditate on this stupendous example of power and mercy, and not exclaim with the Patriarch, to whom in vision it was once presented, "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not!"[1] Who is there but must desire to share in the admiration and reverence of the Angelic Hosts!—seeing that "God created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the Church the manifold Wisdom of God."[2]

Now it is an essential part of this great work, that He who first bore our nature during His sojourn upon earth, was afterwards exalted with the same man's being into Heaven: "Thou sittest at the right hand of God in the glory of the Father." "This same Jesus," who was our Mediator upon earth, "is taken up into Heaven."[3] By this means it is that we have a Mediator above—that our nature[4] has been introduced into God's higher courts—that as the Son of God is interested in our doings upon earth, so are we concerned in the actings of the Son of Man in heaven. Such a consequence did Our Lord declare would follow from His Ascension: "I go to prepare a place for you."[5] "Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast

[1] Genesis xxviii. 16. [2] Ephesians iii. 9, 10. [3] Acts i. 11.
[4] "Unde ergo ibi sedemus, si naturam nostram in Christo non ibi habemus?"—*Vigil. c. Eut.* iv. 9. [5] St. John xiv. 2.

given Me."[1] And the efficacy of His interference on man's behalf is grounded on the permanency of the office which He discharges above: "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."[2] This is the function, then, which our great Mediator performs in heaven: "we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."[3] And this was the completion of that work for which He had been marked out by ancient prophecy: for after having borne the "sin of many" He "made intercession for the transgressors."[4]

Now, since Our Lord's Intercession is part of His work as Mediator, both of those natures which pertain to Him must be engaged in this service of mercy for mankind. For that He was Mediator was shown not to be the mere exercise of an office which any could undertake, but to result from that real conjoining of man to God which arose from His uniting in one person the nature of each. For there is "one Mediator between God and men." What the manhood contributes to this work is to speak on our behalf, to be the representative of our nature, inasmuch as "we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Thus does Our Lord fulfil the office of the Pattern Man, because by the constitution of His nature He was *really* the Pattern of our race. Now, to act on our behalf towards God is to discharge a Priest's[5] function, and a Priest implies an offering; but it is still His man's nature which furnishes forth the victim which is presented, as well as the Priest who offers it. For what He pleads before God is that perfect sacrifice of His own body which He offered once for all upon the Cross for the transgressions of a world. And with these functions of His man's nature does His Godhead perpetually co-operate, by consecrating His man's nature to be a perpetual Priest, and by rendering His sacrifice an inestimable

[1] St. John xvii. 24. [2] Hebrews vii. 25. [3] 1 John ii. 1.
[4] Isaiah liii. 12. [5] Heb. v. 1.

offering. For He is an "High Priest, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens," because He is "the Son, who is consecrated for evermore;"[1] and because "through the Eternal Spirit He offered Himself without spot to God," therefore He "entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."[2] Thus then He who is personally God and man acts through His manhood as the perpetual High Priest for His brethren; and for ever pleads that perfect sacrifice of Himself which He shared our nature to offer. And thus is He represented in the Book of Revelation, where "a Lamb as it had been slain"[3] is described as standing before God's throne, and as the perpetual object of worship to the ransomed in heaven. So that Our Lord's Incarnation sets forth Heaven and Earth as being the real counterpart of that which was dimly shadowed out by the Jewish Ritual. For "of the things which we have spoken this is the sum; we have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens"—who "hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also He is the Mediator of a better covenant;" and who "for this cause is the Mediator of the New Testament." "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us."[4]

But however clearly these truths are stated in Scripture, there is peculiar difficulty in bringing them as an existing reality before the mind. Past and Future are great words, and the changes which they necessarily involve are so strange and eventful, that it seems not inconceivable that the great work of our Redemption should have been wrought in the one, and that the awful hour of Judgment should await us in the other. That events, in themselves improbable, will occur at some time or other in the infinite lapse of time, is readily admitted. But that *now*, at this very moment, while the tide of events is pursuing its uninter-

[1] Heb. vii. 26, 28.
[2] Heb. ix. 12, 14.
[3] Revelation v. 6.
[4] Heb. viii. 1, 6; ix. 15, 24.

rupted course, there should be such great things transacting in which we have a present part, it is almost impossible to realize. This is one of those cases in which to look at things invisible as an actual object, external to the mind, is so difficult. When we see the ordinary frivolity of man's life, we can hardly feel his condition and interests to be in reality of such serious import. To connect his doings with those wonders of the world unseen, which Scripture tells us are going on at the same moment, is like dovetailing the games of childhood into the serious business of life. Our reason revolts at a process which "the course of this world" so plainly contradicts. Thus does the Atheism of practical life react against our Doctrinal Confessions. If prayers were offered daily in all our churches, and if the perpetual ministration of holy things witnessed to a living belief in the nation's mind, men's feelings might be more in accordance with the declarations of Scripture ; but at present they look at the actings of Christ Our Lord as exerted either at the beginning or the end of the system they live in. His present interference they limit to that communication with man's inner thoughts which seems the natural manner in which a Spiritual Being acts upon us ; and that things are daily going on around us by which our position and interests are actually affected—that Christ's intercession is truly taking place above, and that the ordinances of the Church are our means of participating in it—they cannot bring their imagination to admit. Christ's interference they suppose must respect something larger and more important than the ordinary wants of man. It belongs to those days of wonder when heaven and earth shall be confounded, as when His feet stood formerly on the Mount of Olives, and when all nations shall behold Him at the crack of doom.

When the ancient philosophers contemplated this material firmament, its matchless beauty, its unvarying laws, its incalculable extent, they felt unable to subordinate things so majestic to the impotence of mankind. And their feeling certainly was not unnatural, for "one in a certain place testified, saying, What

is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the Son of Man that Thou visitest him?"[1] Hence does Aristotle rate that knowledge which concerns the external world, "cælique vias ac sidera monstrat," more highly than what relates to man, because the subject of this last is so inferior. This is in reality much the same feeling which has rolled back upon us in modern days through the practical heathenism of civilized life. And its only antidote is that which once dashed to pieces the Dagon of ancient Idolatry, when it was enshrined in all the glory of earthly pomp in the great temple of the Roman Empire. For that which shows the real dignity of man's nature, and corrects those opinions of his insignificance which unaided reason not unfitly suggests, is the Incarnation of Christ. And thus does it prepare us for that truth of Our Lord's Intercession which otherwise our imagination could hardly accept. For thus is heaven and earth set before us as one mighty temple, wherein the Son of Man is discharging His work of advocacy for our race. And low as men may be fallen through sin, yet since the Son of God did not disdain to take our nature, there is no other thing which we may not believe that He will effect for our sakes. Thus is Christ's work of Mediation grounded upon that self-originating nature of the Ever-Blessed Godhead, which (p. 121) is the basis of all existence. For this world, with its diversified contrivances and never-ending activity, is but the shadow and reflection of that Divine Being by whose will it exists. And in this Blessed Godhead is there truly that diversity of Persons on which the functions of Mediation and Intercession depend. And for their exercise was the world created. For "the Lord hath made all things for Himself." And especially was this the object of man's being, "forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God."[2] For "this people have I formed for Myself—they shall show forth My praise." That He might exercise, then, this His Sacred Office, did the Son take our nature. And, therefore, that the universe should be built upon this principle—that the Eternal Son should

[1] Hebrews ii. 6. [2] 1 Corinthians xi. 7.

be for ever discharging this work—that man should be thought worthy of so much consideration—that the Second Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity should first sacrifice Himself for our sakes, and then for ever act the part of our Intercessor—all this is to be attributed not to man's deserts, but to "the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God: how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out."[1]

The only true reality, therefore—that which at this moment all men ought to remember—the fact in which the whole world has a common interest—on which those who read and he who writes are alike dependent—which affects every age, state, and country, which obtains for all an interval of trial and a hope of pardon—is that the Son of God is even at this very moment at the right hand of the Father, pleading the merits of His death as the prevailing Intercessor for His brethren. And yet the transitory affairs of life appear to us of overwhelming importance; the achievements of individuals and the prosperity of nations occupy every thought; and the tide of corrupt passion flows on in the very sight of heaven. The reason of course is that our weak faith is insufficient to master our corrupt nature. Yet something must be attributed also to the erroneousness as well as to the weakness of faith; and those two classes of error, which re-appeared continually in ancient times as abstract misconceptions of Our Lord's nature, will be found to re-assert their influence in that practical unbelief which is characteristic of modern times. The heresies which in ancient days interfered with the true belief in Christ were founded on a forgetfulness of one or other of those natures, on which His Mediation depended; so that Jesus was not truly God according to the Arian, or the Christ not really man, according to the Sabellian hypothesis. Just the same alternation of errors may be found in the present day, either contrasted with one another, if we consider their speculative origin; or agreeing, if we regard their practical denial of that real work of Our Lord's Mediation, to which both are

[1] Romans xi. 33.

equally opposed. The Socinian or Arian tendency of modern days either looks upon Our Lord as having been always a mere man, or supposes, at all events, that though intrusted formerly with a Divine power for the work of Atonement which He descended to effect, yet that His Godhead is now swallowed up again in the Father's glory, that His work of Mediation is over, and that our sole relation to Him at present, is to depend, and reflect with gratitude, on His past work, to believe that it is our ground of salvation, and to contemplate those lessons and that example whereby He lives among us as a man upon earth. This last species of Arianism, as entertained by those who call themselves Christians, is nearly identical with that Sabellian heresy which is attained by moving in an opposite direction, from a denial of the real Manhood of Christ. So that it was truly remarked by the late Mr. Blanco White, who made unhappy trial of both these errors, under that practical form in which they are at present predominant, that Sabellianism is only Socinianism in disguise. For the Sabellian theory is, that there exists no real diversity of Persons in the Ever-Blessed Trinity; but that for the sake of a temporary economy, and during the season of His acting towards men upon earth, it pleased HIM who commonly calls Himself the Eternal Father, to be known under the names of the Son and of Christ. His presence upon earth therefore, however its particular events may be explained, must have arisen from the mere indwelling of Divine power in some fleshly habitation, and could not be that personal and permanent[1] union between God and man which is witnessed by the Church (p. 114). Now this notion is manifestly inconsistent with a belief that at this present moment man is God and God is man, and therefore, that our Mediator is for ever pleading the merits of that sacrifice, which in His own identical Person He effected on the Cross. For in truth, according to this theory, there is no pleading of

[1] One of the heresies condemned by S. Greg. Naz. (*Ep.* i. *ad Cledonium*, p. 739) is, "sanctam carnem nunc depositam esse, nudamque ac corpore vacuam divinitatem esse," &c.

man's nature with God : the Son is merely a title substituted for His Father's name during the mediatorial government of the Church—the reality of His acts is evaporated—and a practical unbelief in His operations is justified by His real non-existence in the world of external realities. So necessary is the true Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity to the real acceptance of the Mediation of Christ. And that which countenances the practical unbelief of the age is a too prevalent doctrinal unsoundness. Where the reality of Our Lord's Mediation is firmly held, and He is believed to be an actual Person other than the Eternal Father, yet of one nature with Him, who is truly making Intercession for His brethren by the perpetual pleading of His crucified body at the right hand of God, a ground-work is afforded for men's belief in the objective existence of things unseen which cannot be altogether inefficacious.

It is for the setting forth of this truth that the Scripture statements respecting Our Lord's present work as God and Man in His seen and unseen kingdom have been provided. For not only has He been beheld by mortal eyes in His place of glory —for St. Stephen saw the "Son of Man," Christ according to His human nature, "standing on the right hand of God;"[1] not only did St. Paul hear Him declare His identity with that body of the Church with which His manhood unites Him—"why persecutest thou Me?"—but in the Book of Revelation is displayed at large that Christian Ritual which unites heaven and earth. For whatever interpretation be adopted of that part of the Book of Revelation which relates to events on earth—whether with the school of Mede it be supposed a continuous narrative of the future—or whether it be regarded as a set of pictures, repeatedly fulfilled in the successive relations of the Church and the world—its description of things above is plainly a vision of the same truth which in the Epistle to the Hebrews is set forth argumentatively, that the whole Jewish Ritual was an "example and shadow of heavenly things."[2] Its

[1] Acts vii. 56. [2] Heb. viii. 5.

fourth chapter, therefore, discovers to us the heavenly state, exactly as it was typified by the presence of Jehovah in the wilderness with the camp of Israel. The Living Beings who represent the whole Christian congregation are described as surrounding the Throne of God, just as the tribes of Israel, with their corresponding emblems, encircled the Tabernacle of the congregation. In front of the Throne, where was placed the altar on which the lamb of the daily sacrifice was perpetually presented, "stood a Lamb as it had been slain."[1] Within the Jewish Tabernacle, as afterwards within the Temple, the first compartment was the Holy Place, where incense was perpetually offered. It was separated only by a veil from the Most Holy Place, of which the main characteristic was the Mercy-seat, the especial place where the Shekinah appeared. And so too we have in heaven for the offering of incense, "the golden altar which was before the Throne."[2] The Mercy-seat, indeed, was separated from the altar of incense which stood before it, by the veil of the Temple. But the omission of this veil in the description of the heavenly Temple in the Book of Revelation is exactly accordant with its general explanation of the Jewish Ritual. For it separated between the outer Tabernacle, which was a symbol of God's dwelling among men, and the inner, which typified His heavenly presence. So they are explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the first is said to be "a figure for the time then present," that is, a type of God's presence, as it was vouchsafed to the nation which was appointed to serve Him; while the second was a type of "heaven itself,"[3] whither Christ entered through the sacrifice of Himself. Now, the breaking down of the separation between heaven and earth was the very thing which was effected by Christ's death, whereby we have "boldness to enter into the holiest by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh." Therefore, not only was the veil of the Temple rent at the hour of His sacri-

[1] Rev. iv. 6; v. 6. [2] Rev. viii. 3. [3] Heb. ix, 9, 24.

fice, as a sign of what was passing, but the graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which slept, arose and attended upon His Resurrection, as a proof that when He had "overcome the sharpness of death," He had opened "the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers." Thus was exhibited in fact, what in the Book of Revelation is shown in figure, that the prayers which are offered on earth can ascend to heaven through the path which has been opened for them by Christ their Intercessor. And, therefore, when "the prayers of all Saints" were offered upon "the golden altar which was before the Throne," no veil[1] obstructed their access, but "the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the Saints ascended up before God."

That the scene described in the Book of Revelation represents the collective service of God's people is affirmed by St. Irenæus, a most adequate witness of what was understood to be the intention of St. John's vision. "There is an altar," he says, "in heaven, for to it our prayers and oblations are directed; and a Temple, as St. John says in the Revelation, 'the Temple of God was opened in heaven;' and there is likewise a Tabernacle, for 'the Tabernacle of God is with men.'"[2] And the same view appears to have been entertained by all the earliest

[1] Here we see the explanation of what has sometimes been alleged to be an error in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the altar of incense is not spoken of as connected with the Holy Place, but is represented as appertaining to the Most Holy. Our translators, like the Vulgate, seem to have designed to meet the difficulty by employing the word *Censer* (Heb. ix. 4) for that which the old Itala rendered the Altar of Incense. But θυμιατήριον is the word employed by St. Clement for the Altar of Incense (Strom. v. p. 665), and it seems incredible that all mention of the altar should be omitted. Now to leave out of account all higher considerations, how can it be supposed that a writer so conversant with the Jewish Ritual as the author of this Epistle, could either be silent or mistaken respecting one of its most essential features? But let it be considered that the writer was contemplating the Jewish service through that reality which it was intended to represent, and therefore that he viewed the offerings which were laid upon God's altar as they might be viewed after the veil was done away in Christ, and the altar of incense would, in truth, pertain to the Mercy-seat, before which it was placed, and not to the outer sanctuary in which it was situate. [2] Revelation xi. 19; xxi. 3.—S. Irenæus, iv. 18, 6, p. 252.

writers, who everywhere supposed the Holy Place, or outer division of the Tabernacle, to have been symbolical of the state of God's people upon earth—first, in their Jewish form, and afterwards in their Christian character. "Midway between the veil and the external covering, where the Priests only might enter, lay the altar of incense, symbolical of this present world and its state. This place lying midway between the Most Holy Place and the external court of the people, they [*i.e.*, the Jews] speak of as intervening between heaven and earth."[1] Such was the view which men would naturally take of it while the way into the holiest of all was not yet open, and while the Jewish worship alone kept up the hope of allying earth with heaven. "But Christ being come, an High Priest of good things to come, entered in once into the Holy Place." So that "we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him." And, therefore, says Origen, "that outer sanctuary I suppose to be a type of the Church in which we are at present placed, while we are in the flesh."[2] So that the prayers of men are perpetually ascending to God, not only for the sake of that victim, who is ever set forth "a Lamb as it had been slain" before God's throne, but likewise because the veil, by which heaven and earth are naturally divided, is rent asunder in His flesh.[3] And thus a real service is continually going on, in which our Mediator is pleading the merits of that crucified body which He offered for our sakes.

Now, by what means we take part individually in this offering shall be shown hereafter, and what are the services for which the Intercession of Christ obtains acceptance. The thing at present considered is that Intercession itself. It is a true work going on from day to day, from which all human supplications derive their value. "The prayers of all Saints" are effectual, because they are presented "upon the golden altar" which is "before the throne." So that the Christian service

[1] S. Clement's *Stromata*, v. p. 665.
[2] Origen on Levit. *Hom.* ix. 9, vol. ii. p. 243.
[3] Heb. x. 20.

throughout the world resembles the Jewish, in being a national Ritual. "The holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee." But the Christian nation is not limited like the Jewish by earthly pedigree; neither is the one sex debarred from the same fulness of approach which is conceded to the other; "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, but ye are all one in Christ Jesus."[1] And this one Christian people has likewise one mother city, where its collective offering is presented on its behalf. But its capital is not on earth, but in heaven, for "Jerusalem which is above is the mother of us all."[2] And it has one Priest, who, "because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood."[3] And it has a single victim, who has made "one perpetual sacrifice" (so should the words be rendered) "for sins."[4] And therefore has the Church been directed by His express command to offer all prayers for His sake. For thus is that Mediation maintained which constitutes Him the real Priest and the only victim. When He was upon earth, those who saw Him addressed to Him requests as one man does to another. They addressed themselves to His man's nature, as His manhood could then be approached. But now this mode of access is over, and yet the truth of His Mediation implies that it is only through Him who is man that we have access to God. Therefore we are to address God in prayer, for God is the unseen object of our worship, but we are to address God only through Him whose Intercession as man is the ground of our hopes. "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." To approach God in any other manner would be to claim such merit for our own prayers as would imply that the Mediation of Christ was superfluous. For if we could approach God by ourselves, we should not need the intervention of Him who became man for our sakes. Therefore, to believe in Christ's Mediation, is

[1] Gal. iii. 28.
[2] Gal. iv. 26.
[3] Heb. vii. 24.
[4] Heb. x. 12.

to believe that through His manhood[1] alone can the Father be addressed. Even what He Himself bestows on us as God, He bestows for the sake of that man's nature, which gives Him unity with our race: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son."[2]

Thus it is, then, that we give effect to Our Lord's Mediation; that we recognize it as an actual work which He is discharging for us both as God and Man. To this all prayer is relevant—on this all worship depends. The Church's service goes on from year to year, as His Intercession is perpetually made and perpetually accepted. And we supplicate for it by our belief in His present acts, and by our knowledge of His present nature. Every prayer which we conclude in His name is as much an appeal to His man's nature as though in Psalm or Litany we were to number all His limbs, and recount all the circumstances of His Passion: "By the mystery of Thy Holy Incarnation; by Thy Holy Nativity and Circumcision; by Thy Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation; by Thine Agony and Bloody Sweat; by Thy Cross and Passion; by Thy precious Death and Burial; by Thy Glorious Resurrection and Ascension; and by the Coming of the Holy Ghost:

"Good Lord, Deliver Us."

CHAPTER X.

OUR LORD'S SPIRITUAL PRESENCE AS MEDIATOR WITH MEN.

Our Lord's acts on our behalf towards God, since His Ascension into heaven, are comprehended in Holy Scripture under the name

[1] On this principle was built the practice of the African Church, which, though addressing prayers to the Son at other times, prescribes: "Cum Altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio."—*Con. Carth. Can.* 23, *Hard.* i. p. 963.

Mr. Maskell (*Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, p. 32) gives the reason from Card. Bona, "quia Missa repræsentatio est ejus oblationis, qua Christus se Patri obtulit."

[2] St. John xvi. 23; xiv. 13.

of His Intercession. His actions as Mediator towards man may in like manner be summed up in the single term of His Presence. For so He has Himself taught us in the last words of St. Matthew's Gospel, leaving it as a sufficient warrant and charter for those who were commissioned to "make disciples of all nations," that "I am with you always, even to the end of the world." All the blessings which Our Mediator bestows, are comprehended in this one, or consequent upon it. The efficacy of Christian prayers is because He is in the midst; so identified is He with His people, that the prediction of the Old Testament that He should receive gifts, is declared in the New to have been fulfilled at His Ascension, because then He gave them;[1] and the peculiar blessing conferred by the gift of the Holy Ghost, is explained to be His own return: "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you."[2] For on His Presence who is Mediator between God and Man, is our whole life dependent; the winds may rage, the waters swell, but while He is in the ship it cannot perish; those who are assured of their union with Him have the only pledge of safety: "My Father which gave them Me is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand." This great truth, then, of Our Lord's Presence with His people, we proceed in some feeble manner to set forth; and like the ointment which was poured upon His sacred body, may this service be accepted, not according to its intrinsic value, but as a token of reverence and of worship.

Since it has been revealed to us that in Our Lord two distinct natures have been conjoined in one Presence, to inquire what is meant by His Presence among men, of necessity involves the consideration how far each nature contributes to it. For since He is man as well as God, there must be a presence of the inferior as well as of the higher nature; and since it was for the very purpose of Mediation that He united them, so long as either is excluded, it is impossible to estimate the full extent of His office. So that it is necessary to ask what is meant by that peculiar Presence of

[1] Ephesians iv. 8; Psalm lxviii. 18. [2] St. John xiv. 8.

Christ, which He exercises as the God-man. It is not enough to say that Christ is a Divine Being, who is present in some manner or other, since this would not be to advance beyond the simplest truth of natural religion. This might only be the Sabellian custom of calling God by the name of Christ, without discriminating those conditions under which the Second Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity has been pleased to reveal Himself. To believe in God's existence is to believe in an Infinite Being, who must, therefore, in some manner or other be everywhere at hand. But this falls far short of believing in Christ as a Mediator. The doctrines of revealed religion are those which we seek; and it will not suffice, therefore, to rest in such thoughts of a Divine Presence as the mere religion of nature will supply. This might consist with a disbelief in the reality of those external gifts of grace, on which man's regeneration is dependent. We must pass beyond this to "the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ."[1] This mystery it was the very object of Scripture to reveal, and there will be points in it, therefore, by which the interests of the simplest Christian will be affected. Our object is not to settle any abstract questions respecting Christ's nature, but only to assert that there is such reality in His Presence as the doctrine of His Mediation involves. The points to be established are: First—That according to Scripture, Christ's predicted Presence is His Presence as Man, as well as His Presence as God. Secondly—That the Presence of Christ, according to His human nature, is a spiritual not a carnal Presence. Thirdly—That to be the agent whereby Christ is thus present is the peculiar office of God the Holy Ghost. Fourthly—That hereby mankind receive those spiritual blessings which the Head and Pattern of the renewed race has made His own manhood the channel for communicating to His brethren.

I. Now, the promise of His perpetual Presence was not given to Our Lord's Disciples after His Resurrection only, but it

[1] Colossians ii. 2.

had also been communicated previously, as St. John informs us, for their support in His season of humiliation. The promise was, that He who was taken from them should come back: "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." This was the especial advantage which they were to receive through the influence of the Comforter: "I will come again and receive you unto Myself."[1] And this was a promise which the residue of the world should not share; it was the peculiar privilege as it was the peculiar hope of Our Lord's chosen followers: "A little while and the world seeth Me no more, but ye see Me; because I live, ye shall live also." Our Lord's declaration, therefore, could not have referred to that coming as Judge in which all men will have an equal share. Neither could it be fulfilled during that interval of forty days which followed His Resurrection, because He goes on to say that "we will come unto him and make our *abode* with him."[2] His promises look to the restoration of that which was about to be lost to them—the presence, namely, of Our Lord according to His human nature. They seem not to be adequately fulfilled by that mere presence of Deity of which no part of space can ever be divested. In this sense Our Lord never left them,[3] and could never return. That which went away and came again must in some way or other have had relation to the human substance, to which departure and restoration properly belong. And, accordingly, when the promise of perpetual Presence was given before His Ascension, it was directly grounded on that new authority, with which, according to His man's nature, He was invested: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations;" "and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Again, that Our Lord's Presence has especial reference to His human nature may be inferred from the limitation which binds

[1] St. John xiv. 18, 3. [2] St. John xiv. 19, 23.

[3] "Ibat per id quod homo erat, et manebat per id, quod Deus erat."—*S. Aug. in Joan.* 78, 1.

it to places, times, and modes of action. It pertains to the very essence of Deity to be everywhere; and, therefore, when Our Lord said, "where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them," His words connect themselves with that other nature, according to which alone it was possible that He should be absent.

But it will naturally occur as objections both to this statement and to that expectation which might have been built, as is alleged, upon the promise to the Apostles: First, that in the gift of the Holy Ghost the coming of a Divine Person is plainly promised; and secondly, that under the ancient covenant the Almighty bestowed His help in such particular places, times, and manners, on His chosen people, as to justify the expression, "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." [1] These considerations, however, will be found only to substantiate what has been advanced. Leaving the first for the present, it is sufficient to say in regard to the second, that one essential condition of the Doctrine of Mediation is, that whatever means of access were afforded men in former times, either by Temple, Prophet, or Angel, have all been concentrated under the Gospel Covenant in the manhood of Christ. For in Him, as "the Son of Man," [2] we see the true Jacob's Ladder, whereby the Angels hold intercourse with earth; so that since His Incarnation, their ministrations have had reference either to His natural body, or to His body mystical, the Church.[3] And He is the one Prophet [4] of the New Covenant, and His flesh is "the true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." And, therefore, that God should have spoken "at sundry times and in divers manners," does not interfere with the truth that in the Gospel Covenant His promises are all centred in the Presence of that "one Mediator, the *Man* Christ Jesus." It is not meant that God could not connect His blessings with particular persons or places, but that to do so was to employ created medi a as instru-

[1] Exod. xxxiii. 14.
[2] St. John i. 51.
[3] Rev. xxii. 9; Eph. iii. 10.
[4] Heb. i. 1.

ments of His mercy, and that all such media have been superseded by the one Person of the Incarnate Son. In his day was Moses a Mediator; the Priests were Mediators; the Angels exercised an intermediate ministry. But all these only exercised a function by way of office, which in the fulness of time was taken in its completeness by Him, who, by the constitution of His nature, was the true and real Mediator between God and Man. So that what happened beforetime was subordinate to that which was actually fulfilled in the Incarnation of Christ; and it was in His Person who could say primarily, "the Father is in Me, and I in Him,"[1] that "the Tabernacle of God" was "with men."[2]

And further it must be considered that those interventions which were allowed in earlier times were through the power and agency of the same uncreated Word who has concentrated all the functions of Mediation in His human body, since that day when by an Angel He announced His approach. His previous selection therefore of places, times, and persons, is no ground for doubting, but rather countenances that rule, which it has been His will to adopt since He became manifest in the flesh. It is not of moment to the general argument whether on those earlier occasions He spoke to men directly, or employed the intervention of inferior beings as instruments of His will. The first appears to have the opinion of some of the most ancient writers;[3] since the time of St. Augustin,[4] the assertion that the law was "received by the disposition of Angels,"[5] has been taken usually in its literal sense. Perhaps both opinions may be well founded, and the Uncreated Angel, who had appeared to Moses at the Bush, may have given place after the transgression of the Israelites to the Created Angel,[6] who subsequently guided them. Some such change in the manner of their direc-

[1] St. John x. 38. [2] Revelation xxi. 3.
[3] *Tertullian ad. Marc.* ii. 27; *ad. Prax.* 14 and 16; Just. *Dial. cum Tryphone*, 56—60.
[4] *De Trinitate*, iii. 11; vide Pet. *De Trin.* viii. 2, 15.
[5] Acts vii. 53. [6] Exod. xxxiii. 2, 3.

tion is expressly recorded. That it was an Angel who subsequently appeared to Daniel[1] is manifest, since he "speaks of Michael as his fellow," and such was probably the leader of the Lord's Host,[2] who was beheld by Joshua.[3] But, however this point may be decided, it was plainly the Eternal Word who was present, whether by vision or by His ministers, since He it was, who even in former times had His "delights with men." And since His Incarnation, He has concentrated in His man's nature whatever opportunities of union with Him were before possessed. To Himself, as Man, and not "unto the Angels," did He put in subjection that coming dispensation[4] of the Gospel which we now possess. And, therefore, whereas in earlier time those ministering beings were received by men with such signs of reverent salutation as the inferior might well pay to the superior creature, as the examples of Manoah,[5] and Daniel,[6] if not of Joshua[7] declare; yet was similar submission refused by the Angel whom St. John beheld, because "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book."[8] So that now whatsoever has the character of worship is to pass through that one channel which through the human nature of the Eternal Word has been opened to mankind. By God's Presence was intended in former times whatever opportunity of intercourse was afforded through those earthly instruments of Mediation which He was pleased to adopt as His temporary representatives among men. But now a new mode of Mediation has been substituted for all other conditions either of time or place. And the efficacy of prayer is grounded upon the assurance of that peculiar Presence

[1] Daniel x. 5–14,

[2] Josh. v. 15.

[3] This is maintained by Dr. Mill, with his usual learning and ability, in his *Christian Advocate's Publication* for 1841.

[4] Heb. ii. 5.

[5] Judges xiii. 20.

[6] Dan. x. 15.

[7] Josh. v. 14.

[8] Rev. xxii. 9. "Before, in the Old Testament [Angels] suffered David to sit upon his knees before them (1 Chron. xxi. 16); since, in the New they endure not St. John should fall down to them."—*Bishop Andrews. Sermon I. on the Nativity.*

which through His human nature Our Lord vouchsafes, because it rests upon the reality of His Mediation: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." To refer this to His Divine nature alone would be to neutralize the efficacy of His Mediation, since it is His character as Man which has rendered Him the counterpart of those means of access which before existed. And since it is as Mediator that He is present among men, His presence must plainly be through that human nature which He has taken as the means of union between heaven and earth.

II. But though Our Lord's Presence be the Presence of His man's nature, it is yet a spiritual and not a carnal Presence. Christ is present with His people and present as man, but He is present not by material contact, but by spiritual power. Though that human nature which is material as well as immaterial may not be left out when we speak of His Presence as Mediator, yet His Presence is brought about through the power of that other nature which is wholly immaterial and Divine. For when His Incarnation joined Manhood and Godhead together, it left the essential properties of each undestroyed. What these properties are we may in some measure conclude from the experience of our own being. For from our own nature[1] we gain a knowledge of two modes of existence, which we describe respectively as body and spirit. We call that bodily which is present in place and limited by outline; and of this kind of existence our senses either take note, or we feel a conviction that, if they were subtile enough, they would be able to take note of it. That other kind of existence, of the reality whereof we are equally persuaded, but which is free from such conditions, we speak of as spiritual. And we have a conviction respecting the modes of action, which belong to each of these kinds of existence, which is not to be called a

[1] *Vigil. c. Eutych.* v. 6.

consequence of the definition which has been assigned to them, but is part of the original idea, which the name either of body or spirit expresses. For respecting the first, as Tucker observes, it is "an uncontroverted maxim and self-evident truth," "that nothing can act or be acted upon where it is not."[1] This appears to be a portion of what is intended, when we say that bodies are present in space. And therefore even in respect to such influences as gravity, we feel a conviction that there must be what he expresses as "some medium passing between the agent and the patient." The actings of spirit, on the other hand, are not shackled, so far as we know, by any such law. To suppose them subject to it would, in fact, be to maintain that spirit is present in place, which is contrary to our whole idea of its nature. And therefore when Our Lord by His word healed persons who were at a distance from Him, none ever hesitated to assign His actions to a spiritual power, because they were obviously independent of any material medium. There may be other qualities in each nature which we do not discern, but this is what men commonly mean to express by body and spirit. Our knowledge of either is derived from the fact that each man is a link between these two dissimilar kingdoms. For one is as real as the other, and though our acquaintance with them is gained in different ways, yet it rests ultimately on the same principle of inward consciousness. The existence of what is material cannot, properly speaking, be proved by experiment, for experiment only proves that certain impressions are made upon our senses: and what is to assure us that these impressions have counterparts in the external world? The irresistible conviction of our own mind is our assurance. And from the same source, according to the saying of Descartes, *cogito ergo sum*, have we the assurance of our spirit's existence.

In this manner it is, then, that we become conversant with these two worlds of matter and of spirit, our chief knowledge of which is, in truth, only a conviction that the one is a reality

[1] *Light of Nature*, vol. ii. p. 1, c. 5.

existing without and within our body and our mind, just as much as the other. Now, we learn from Holy Writ, that in Christ our Mediator there is that man's nature in which these two principles of matter and spirit exist together, and also that nature of God which is wholly immaterial. For "God is a Spirit." And in Christ these two natures retain each their perfect essence, though each co-operating towards the execution of His Will. For though glorified, it is yet with a man's body that He has risen and ascended. So He assured His Disciples after His Resurrection: "Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have." "We nothing doubt," says Hooker, "but God hath many ways, above the reach of our capacities, exalted that body, which it hath pleased Him to make His own."[1] And what may be within the capacity of human bodies we know not. St. Paul was caught up into the third heaven: whether it was in the body or out of the body, as he knew not, others cannot affirm. The miraculous appearances, therefore, of Our Lord's body to His Disciples after His Resurrection, are not inconsistent with the reality of His corporeal frame. But we are expressly told that at His Ascension Our Lord's body went up into heaven, as into a place which it will inhabit, subject to the conditions of material existence, till the Last Day: "This same Jesus which is taken up from you, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." For "the heaven must receive" Him, "until the times of restitution of all things." In this abode accordingly was He beheld by St. Stephen in his hour of martyrdom. To assert of this Body which ascended into heaven that it had no material conditions different from those which belong to simple Deity, would be the error of Eutyches, who maintained that the properties of Our Lord's Manhood were altogether lost in His Godhead. Now, "there is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body, but by the true and natural properties of His body. Amongst

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 54, 9.

which properties, definite or local presence is chief." For if His material presence could be in heaven and also upon earth, then, as Hooker expresses it, "hath the majesty of His estate extinguished the verity of His nature."[1] And to this our Church refers when she asserts that to be in "two places at once" is against the "*truth* of Christ's natural Body." She does not enter into the metaphysical properties of substance; but since Our Lord is declared to have a natural body consubstantial with ours, to fix the place of that body in heaven is the same thing as to declare that its material presence is removed from earth.[2] "Make thou no doubt or question of it," saith St. Augustin, "but that the Man Christ Jesus is now in that very place from whence He shall come in the same form and substance of flesh which He carried thither, and from which He hath not taken nature, but given thereunto immortality. According to this form He spreadeth not out Himself into all places. For it behoveth us to take great heed, lest while we go about to maintain the glorious Deity of Him which is man, we leave Him not the true bodily substance of a man."[3] Since Our Lord's Body then is in heaven, and since it belongs to the truth of His manhood that, in regard to its material operations, it should be subject to the conditions which discriminate body from spirit—one of which is to act where they are—it follows that though Our Lord's presence upon earth as Mediator is not independent of His nature as man, yet that it is brought about by His Divine and immaterial nature; that its medium of operation is not material contact, but spiritual power.

We are assured moreover by Our Lord Himself, that the removal of His bodily form into heaven would be a step which should lead to that spiritual Presence which He has since vouchsafed. After declaring the fact that His man's body

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 55, 6.

[2] "Quando in terra fuit caro, non erat utique in cœlo. Et nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utique in terra."—*Vigil. c. Eutych.* iv. 14.

[3] St. Augustin, in Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 55, 6.

would be the medium through which He would convey heavenly gifts—("for My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed;" "this is the bread which cometh down from heaven") —He proceeds to represent His spiritual Presence as consequent on His Ascension into heaven: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before. It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." "When the Son of Man," says St. Leo, "betook Himself to the glory of His Father's Majesty, He began in some ineffable manner to be nearer by His Divine power, for the very reason that, according to His humanity, He was removed further off." And therefore it was, he adds, that Mary Magdalen might not touch Him before His Ascension: "I would not have you come to Me in bodily wise, nor recognize Me by carnal touch: I put you off to something higher, I prepare for you something greater: when I am ascended to My Father, then you shall touch Me in a more true and perfect manner, when you shall lay hold of that which you do not touch, and believe that which you do not behold."[1]

Whether we look, then, to the declarations of Scripture respecting the departure of Our Lord's body from earth to heaven, or to what He tells us of the source of that influence which He there exerts, we must conclude that the Presence of Our Mediator, though not independent of His fleshly nature, is brought about by the intervention of that Divine nature which is irrespective of material contact and of contiguity of place. It only remains to observe further, that such spiritual Presence is not less real than that which is material, depending only on another mode of existence, which has its own being and its own laws. Some persons suppose that nothing is real, except what is sensible; and, therefore, that Christ's real Presence is not identical with His spiritual Presence—that those who assert the one, deny the other. Their mistake arises from the circumstance, that language is founded upon terms which are supplied to us

[1] S. Leo, *Sermon*, lxxii. 4.

by our observation of the world of sense, so that the operations of mind can only be expressed by analogies and figures. But what is figurative is the expression—not the thing expressed. The word spirit is derived from "spiro," to "breathe or blow," in consequence of the analogy, pointed out by Our Lord Himself,[1] between the more subtile part of the material world and that world which is immaterial. But because the word "spirit" is a metaphorical term, derived in the Latin and Greek languages from the action of the breath, we are not to infer that there is no such principle in man as an immaterial soul. The necessary deficiencies of language do not derogate from the certainty of those existences to which our consciousness witnesses, and which lead us up by the shortest track to the very throne of God. "For God did not make our spirits and depart from them, but they are of Him and in Him."[2] And unless spirit be something less real than body, spiritual presence is not less real than bodily presence. All that can be asserted of it is, that it is of a different nature and regulated by a different law. Bodies are present by contiguity of place—spirits by a different law. When we speak, therefore, of our Lord's spiritual Presence, the word *Presence* which we employ is a figurative term certainly, because it is borrowed from the world of matter: but it is not the less a reality, that some peculiar influence or power of our Mediator, the God-man, is exerted through the intervention of His Deity, in those places, times, and manners, to which His Presence is pledged in the Kingdom of Grace.

Neither is this Presence merely that He is an object to men's thoughts, as Jerusalem was present to David from the Land of Hermon. The reality of Christ's Presence depends on Himself, not on those He visits. It had been an unmeaning promise to His Disciples, that His Presence should return to them through the power of the Holy Ghost, had He designed only that through the exertion of their mental faculties they might think

[1] St. John iii. 8.
[2] S. Aug. *Con.* iv. 12, 1.

of Him who was departed. In this sense how is Christ present more than any Angel in light? We are speaking not of men's actings towards Him, but of His actings towards them, since His Ascension into heaven. As He acts *for* them by intercession with the Father, so are we assured that He acts *towards* them by His Presence with Power. What is meant by His office as Mediator, unless through the annexation of the Divine to the Human nature, the latter has in itself some real influence independently of our thoughts? And this is the answer to the assertion, that since a body must either be present in any place, or not present in it, therefore Christ's body must either be materially present in the consecrated elements at the Holy Eucharist, or we must allow that His Presence is merely figurative. Doubtless it were so, if His body were a human body alone; but because He is Divine also, it has likewise that other medium of communication which does not depend upon local contiguity, but upon spiritual power. Even the sun, because its influence is more wide than its actual limits, while it is at rest in its place in the sky, is present upon earth by the effluence of its beams. But that Sacred Manhood which was created for the service of the Mediator between God and men, in which were stored up "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," that from it "grace and truth" might flow forth into the whole race of man, has a real medium of presence through the Deity which is joined to it: so that it can be in all places and with all persons—not figuratively, but in truth—not by material contact, but by the power of a spiritual presence. And while its material place is among the armies of heaven, its spiritual presence is among the inhabitants of the earth, when, how, and wheresoever is pleasing to His own gracious will.

III. It has been asserted, then, that the Presence of Christ is the Presence of His man's nature; and again, that this Presence is brought about not by material contact, but by spiritual power. Now, it was for the very purpose of uniting men in this wise to their great Mediator the man Christ

Jesus, that the gift of the Holy Ghost was bestowed.[1] It is His especial office that those in whom He takes up His dwelling are joined by grace to that man's nature which by personal union is one with God. This point it is which must next be considered.

The gift of the Holy Ghost is declared in Holy Scripture to proceed directly from that Blessed Mediator, who, "when He ascended up on high, led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." What He received in that He was human, the same He had power to give, because He was Divine. The consecration of His man's nature made it the fountain from which grace should flow forth into His brethren. So soon as that exaltation of humanity, which it gained by His Incarnation, was perfected by His consequent Obedience, He bestowed as Mediator that renewing power which the Third Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity was the willing agent to convey. And this is why God the Holy Ghost can be spoken of as *coming to men*, who otherwise, like each Person of the Almighty Three, leaves no portion of space or duration of time unoccupied by His Presence. Now this gift, as the Psalmist predicts, Christ as Mediator was to receive, that afterwards, according to the saying of the Apostle, He might bestow it upon men.[2] For, "being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." And therefore is this Blessed Person of the co-equal Trinity spoken of as sent by the Mediator, because through His exaltation does the Mediator participate by gift in that universal dominion, which as the Eternal Son He participated by nature: "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." "He shall glorify

[1] "The flesh of the Lord," says St. Athanasius, meaning thereby His Humanity, "is a quickening Spirit, because it was engendered by the quickening Spirit; for that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."—*De Incarnat. et c. Arian.* 16, vol. i. p. 883.

[2] Compare Psalm lxviii. 18 and Ephesians iv. 8.

Me, for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine." It is as a result therefore of Our Lord's Mediation that we receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, which He who shares the Eternal Godhead bestows on those to whom He has condescended to be a brother.

And the purpose for which this gift is bestowed falls entirely within the limits of the Mediation of Christ, since its object is that those whom He elects to be His own may be joined to that manhood which He has consecrated. The office of the Holy Ghost in the Gospel Kingdom is that men may become the sons of God by grace by their union with that man who is the Son of God by nature. For as we are men by natural alliance with that first man Adam, who by reason of his creation is *called* God's son, so we are renewed men only if we are joined by supernatural union to that Second Man, the new Adam, who is God's Son by nature. Through this means do spiritual graces descend from God, the fountain of life, into man's being. And in this gracious work it has been the pleasure of God the Holy Ghost to co-operate. "Although the Holy Ghost or Third Person in the Trinity," says Dr. Jackson, "doth immediately and by personal propriety work faith and other spiritual graces in our souls, yet doth He not by these spiritual graces unite our souls or spirits immediately unto Himself, but unto Christ's human nature."[1] And so says St. Athanasius, that "the Spirit is the Unction and the Seal, whereby the Word anoints and seals all things."[2] And for this we have Our Lord's express assurance, in that the perpetual Presence which He promised to His servants, and which has been shown to be the Presence of His man's nature, is declared by Him to be the immediate consequence of the coming and work of the Holy Ghost. For this perpetual Presence is declared to be the result of that departure according to the flesh, whereby He ascended to His Father's glory to receive gifts for men. Christ is perpetually present,

[1] Jackson's *Com. on Creed*, xi. 3, 12. [2] *Ep. I. ad Serap.* 23.

because, being raised to the right hand of power, He is perpetually conferring those spiritual gifts of which His manhood has become the fountain to His brethren. And this He promised to His Disciples as the result of His temporary departure: "A little while and ye shall not see Me; and again a little while, and ye shall see Me, because I go to the Father." "All the best interpreters are decided that the reference is not to Our Lord's bodily Resurrection, with which the words, 'because I go to My father,' are inconsistent; we must rather understand the 'seeing again,' as in St. John xiv. 19, of the inward and spiritual working of Christ." [1] And hence we have the interpretation of the tenth verse of the same chapter: "When He (the Comforter) is come, He will convince (or instruct) [2] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." "Of righteousness because I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more." The instruction concerning righteousness is made to depend on that exaltation of the Mediator into heaven whereby His man's nature has become the fountain of grace. Thus are the lessons of righteousness conveyed to mankind by the Holy Ghost. This Blessed Spirit becomes the agent through which that sanctified humanity of the Son of God exerts its renewing influence upon the defiled humanity of His brethren. "The Spirit testifies as of sin, so of righteousness, because it reveals how the Saviour, though departed in body, works unseen in the renewal of the inner life." [3]

That it should be the office of the Holy Ghost to unite men in this manner to the humanity of Christ is the result therefore of His co-operating in that Mediatorial function which the Eternal Son became Incarnate to undertake. To regard the actings of the Holy Ghost as directed into any other channel, would be to suppose that there was some other name than that

[1] Olshausen on St. John xvi. 16.

[2] ἐλέγχειν, Tholuck observes *in loco*, implies the allied significations of conviction, blame, instruction.

[3] Olshausen on St. John xvi. 10.

of Christ given under heaven, whereby we might be saved. Its real tendency would be to substitute the Holy Ghost in place of the Son, or rather to maintain, that whereas the work of man's government and salvation was at one time discharged by God under the name of Christ, at a later period there was a new title adopted, and the same Being reappeared under the name of the Holy Ghost. And thus we should be led back into the same system of Sabellianism which has been before exhibited, and the real existence of the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity would be lost sight of. True it is that it has been the will of God the Holy Ghost to co-operate with the Word in the work of man's salvation, without always explaining to us what is due to one of these Blessed Persons, and what to the other.[1] At the Incarnation of the Son of God, it was the Holy Ghost who overshadowed His Virgin Mother; and yet "Wisdom hath builded" itself a house out of the materials of man's nature. Again, Christ "by the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God." And there is a perpetual co-operation between these Divine Persons, in that while Christ is that "one Mediator between God and men," the Holy Ghost is that "one and the selfsame Spirit,"[2] through whom His Mediation becomes effectual. Christ is the one "name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." But in this salvation men have part through "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name." So that while Christ is the Head of the body, the Holy Ghost is that living soul by which all its parts are bound together. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." As Christ was "quickened by the Spirit,"[3] so it is asserted of ourselves, that "if we have been planted together in the likeness of His Death, we shall be also in the likeness of His Resurrection." So that St. Austin asserts, "what our spirit or life is to our limbs, such is the Holy Ghost

[1] Vide Preface to St. Hilary, 57–68.
[2] 1 Cor. xii. 11.
[3] 1 Peter iii. 18.

to the members of Christ, that is, to His body the Church."[1] And therefore, whether we regard the influence of the Second Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity, or the co-operation of the Third, it is the purpose alike of each to join us to that manhood of Christ Our Lord whereby He has become Mediator for our race. And St. Gregory complains of it as an error of the Apollinarians, that they interpreted the words, "we have the mind of Christ," as though they referred to His Deity alone, whereas they have reference, he says, to that purified humanity of the Son of God which was set forth as a model to His brethren.[2] For if this principle of interpretation be forgotten, the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity must needs be confounded with the Third, as by the Sabellians both the Second and the Third are confounded with the First. Now, the distinction between the offices of these two Blessed Persons is real, and not merely technical or artificial, because it proceeds from that Personal diversity by which they are really distinguished. And therefore to neglect it, as St. Athanasius[3] complains, would be to make the Blessed Trinity a mere trick [ἄχρι παιδιᾶς], a system of names without truth. And since the proper diversity of Persons in the glorious Godhead is the real beginning of all creaturely existence, and the basis of all thought, the final result of this error would be to resolve everything into a mere abstract Theism, and to absorb all existence into its primary source.

IV. We come now to that point on which this whole Chapter

[1] In Preface to St. Hilary, sec. 78. [2] *Ep. II. to Cledonius*, sec. 6.

[3] "For the name of the Son and of the Spirit would be put an end to, when their purpose was fulfilled. And the whole system of the Gospel would be a mere trick, exhibited in name and not in truth. And since according to this theory the name of the Son would be lost, the grace of Baptism would be lost along with it. For it is a Baptism in the name of the Son. And what will follow but the destruction of the whole creation? For the Word came forth that we might be created, and through His coming forth we exist. And, therefore, if He is lost again in the Father, as the Sabellians represent, we too shall cease to be. For on this principle all is to return to its original estate, and with the office of the Son, they must annihilate His Creation."—*Or. IV. c. Arian.* 25.

is dependent—What is the especial end and purpose of that union with the man's nature of the Son of God, which it is the office of the Holy Ghost to bestow? Such union has been shown to be the real meaning of that Presence with men which was promised as the result of Our Lord's Ascension to the Father. For this Presence is not irrespective of His man's nature; yet not a Presence in place or by material contact: its medium of operation is that spiritual power which the manhood derives from personal union with Deity. But yet the question recurs, what is the object of this Presence? And unless this point be clearly understood, every other part of the inquiry is useless. The mere technical assertion of such a dogma, irrespective of any influence upon man's condition and conduct, would be arbitrary and artificial. So that it would partake of the repulsiveness which naturally attaches to all doctrinal assertions, when they are put forth merely for the purpose of completing a theological system, or of supporting established institutions. In a case so serious as this, men cannot yield their assent to the mere child's play of logical subtilty: and still more are they indignant if sacred considerations are made subservient to mere worldly ends. Conscience and the unseen world ought not to be dealt with as legal fictions. Man's individual account is so much more important than the mere perpetuation of the best scheme of government, that if this be all which is aimed at in authorized formularies, they are of trivial moment when put in competition with the realities of grace and holiness. Men are perfectly right in feeling more interest in what concerns personal religion than in any doctrinal considerations, so long as our salvation depends upon the first, and the second only contribute to the quiet administration of the Church and the country. Such is the case respecting many disputes which unhappily divide Christians. And this it is which makes what are called Church and State questions offensive to serious minds. They are naturally averse to sacrifice the eternal interests of Christ's Kingdom to its mere

temporal organization. No doctrines, therefore, or usages, can be felt to be really important, which do not rest immediately upon what is sacred and Divine. And if the truth of our union with the manhood of Christ Our Lord be worth attending to, it must be in consequence of its connection with the individual hopes and interests of men.

Now, this connection depends upon that leading feature in Our Lord's human character, that He was not *a* man, but *the* man; the Son of Man, that is, in whom the collective character of the race found its representative; the Pattern of our Being; its new Head; who came once in the fulness of time "to gather together all things" in Himself. For through Him was that higher nature[1] introduced into our fallen race, by which its ancient deterioration may be corrected. From which circumstance it follows that salvation is not attained by human efforts, but by the gift of God. For it was not only that Christ exhibited the natural qualities of manhood in their most perfect state, but that He conferred upon it a power which was above nature. Through the union of Godhead and Manhood in His single Person, there was infused into that humanity, which He shared with us, such grace as sufficed for the whole generation of His kindred.[2] That so we might be "made the sons of God, as He the Son of Man; we made partakers of His Divine, as He of our human nature."[3] For this reason the work of Mediation depends upon that union with the Manhood of Christ to which "by one spirit" we are admitted. For the union of mankind with Christ is not a mere imitation—the following a good model—the fixing our thoughts upon One who has shown in the clearest manner how God may be served and men bene-

[1] "Non enim superare possemus peccati et mortis auctorem, nis naturam nostram ille susciperet, et suam faceret, quem nec peccatum contaminare, nec mors potuit detinere."—*S. Leo, Ep.* 24, 2.

[2] "Ὑφοῦται καὶ χρίεται καὶ ἁγιάζεται δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ τρέχῃ εἰς πάντας ἡ χάρις, ὡς ἤδη δοθεῖσα τῇ φύσει, καὶ λοιπὸν ὅλῳ σωζομένη τῷ γένει." —*S. Cyril Thesaurus*, xx. vol. v. p. 197.

[3] Bishop Andrews's *Fourth Sermon on the Nativity.*

fited—it is an actual and a real union, whereby all renewed men are joined to the Second, as they were by nature to the first Adam. This union cannot be explained away in the kingdom of grace, unless it is first explained away in the kingdom of nature. Unless "sin standeth" only "in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk," holiness must involve not the mere imitation, but the putting on, of the man Christ Jesus. By what means the relation is maintained, is in each case an inexplicable mystery; the natural alliance which takes place by descent being not less wonderful than that supernatural alliance which is brought about by regeneration. To analyze the law of family affinity is as much beyond our powers as to understand how "as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." The first is that transmission of the nature of our common ancestor which causes us to be what we are; the second is that spiritual Presence of the manhood of Christ, by union with which we become what it is given to us to be. The one of these is in Holy Writ set against the other. "for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." As the one has its influence both on soul and body, so has the other. The phenomenon which is presented by nature is, that it has pleased God to make the race of mankind dependent on the maintenance of a perpetual succession of beings, in each of whom the original type re-appears under one or other of innumerable modifications, while yet that normal limit is never overpassed, by which the race is separated from other organized forms of existence. This unity of form we refer to that law of descent from a single parent, which appears to extend throughout the whole animal kingdom. That it applies to mankind we are assured on Scriptural authority, since we read that "God has made of one blood all nations of the earth." And that principle on which depends the sameness of forms in transmitted life we call *nature*. It is not meant that in the individuals of the series there is anything distinct from that which makes up their separate personality; but

whereas in the artificial combinations of human thought, "all classifications," as Dugald Stewart[1] observes, "are to a certain degree arbitrary;" the forms of organized life, on the other hand, are fixed by an unvarying external rule, and their classification therefore is not arbitrary. The Nominalists appear to be right in asserting respecting the mere results of human abstraction, that "it does not follow that the distinctive quality of a class is more essential to the existence of each individual, than various other qualities which we are accustomed to regard as accidental." In the case of those things which possess organized life, on the contrary, that which gives [or ought to give] its distinctive name to the class is really essential to the existence of each individual. Our ignorance of the hidden nature of being may render it impossible for us to pronounce what this characteristic condition is; but we can at least go so far as to refer it to that law of descent which preserves the uninterrupted succession of every primary pair. So that the principle of nature owes its existence to the fact that every tribe is set forth in its leader, that all races have their type, that the limits of the class are expressed in its model, and that throughout God's world there is a law of hereditary transmission and family headship.

Now, this rule which God has made the law of nature, is transferred by Revelation to the Kingdom of Grace. For here too we see a Pattern Man, who comes in as the type of restored, as our earthly father of fallen, manhood. He brings with Him from above a pure and perfect, as the other transmitted a corrupt and debilitated nature. And in this case, likewise, the character of the race is dependent upon its Head. For He is "the first-begotten of the dead," "the first-born of every creature." For "the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also

[1] *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, pt. i. c. 4, sec. 2; vide supra, pp. 36 and 156.

that are heavenly." Through Him is given back that perfect image of God wherein man was orignally made. "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." "For the form of God," says St. Basil, "is not like that of man; it is a living form, a truly moulding form, and it fashions everything which receives it into the image of God."[1] Our salvation therefore does not depend merely on our own efforts, on the self-dependent exertions of men to cure their inherent evils, but on the external influence of that Head of our race who mercifully conforms His brethren to His own likeness. So that it is only by a real union with this New Man, that we can eradicate those evils which attached themselves to our race, through the transgression of the old. As true, certain, and extensive as our inherence in the one, must be our adherence to the other. Upon this union depends our right as well in that work of redemption which He effected on the Cross, as in that work of Intercession which He is performing in heaven. For though Christ's death sufficed for the sins of the whole world, yet what right can we claim in Him, unless we are of the number of those for whom He shall hereafter say, "Behold I and the children whom God hath given Me." For however widely the benefits of His death may be extended, yet "they which are *called* receive the *promise* of eternal inheritance." It is for His sheep that "the Good Shepherd giveth His life." There may be unknown effects upon the whole race of man, which may attend this great event, but that which is revealed looks especially to those who are fashioned into a new race, through the overflowing into their nature of that inexhaustible stream of grace which wells forth from the humanity of Christ their Head. For "of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." Now, this reality of union with Christ is further evidenced, because He not only "was delivered for our offences," but "was raised again for our justification." Our salvation, that is, depends upon the gifts which He bestowed, and the Intercession which He has ascended on

[1] *Ad Eun.* v. p. 302 [Garnier].

high to present. And this Intercession is especially offered for His people. So it was expressly declared just before He entered upon this part of His work of Mediation. "I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given Me." "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word." And therefore Christ's acts of Mediation are connected throughout the Epistles with "the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." For He "loved the Church, and gave Himself for it," and He is "the Saviour of the body." These passages indicate that our share in the benefits which Christ attained depends on that union with Himself which He has bestowed upon us. And this union does not mean merely the union which He has with our nature, but the union which we have with His. It depends not merely upon His being a man, but the Head of that family of men who are joined to Him by grace. It does not arise from His having enabled humanity to put forth all its strength, but from His having endowed it with those higher powers which Deity bestowed. The whole seed of man had fallen, when He came into it with that pure and perfect being, which by reason of His being God He never tarnished, and thus formed a new race out of the ruins of the old. So that when He declares Himself to be the vine,[1] He speaks of that human nature into which all Christian men are engrafted.

[1] Vide S. Athan. *Sermo Major de Fide*, Mont. Coll. Nova, ii. 18. S. Aug. in Joan. 80, 2. "St. Cyril reproveth their speeches, which taught that only the Deity of Christ is the vine, whereupon we by faith do depend as branches, and that neither His flesh nor our bodies are comprised in this resemblance. For doth any man doubt but that even from the flesh of Christ our very bodies do receive that life, which shall make them glorious at the latter day, and for which they are already accounted parts of His blessed body? Our corruptible bodies could never live the life they shall live, were it not that here they are joined with His body, which is incorruptible, and that His is in ours as a cause of immortality—a cause by removing through the death and merit of His own flesh, that which hindered the life of ours. Christ is therefore both as God and as man that true vine, whereof we both spiritually and corporally are branches."—*Eccles. Pol.* v. 56, 9.

The assertion then of Our Lord's presence according to His human nature, and of our real union with the manhood of Christ, is no technical or unnecessary dogma, but that pregnant fact on which is built our present regeneration and our future hope. Herein is revealed to us the mysterious truth, that He whose counsels were unalterably fixed before the worlds began, has been pleased in the kingdom of grace to adopt that precedent, which His wisdom had sanctioned in the kingdom of nature. For as the creation of the sons of men was not simultaneous or immediate, but one was chosen to be their common parent, so is the world's renewal committed to a common Head, into whom all the children of grace must, one after another, be incorporated. Thus, as St. Paul expresses it, was Adam "the figure of Him that was to come." And as the perfection of nature was displayed in the one, so was the perfection of grace exhibited in the other. For "the first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven." The principle of such mode of action is, that in the model[1] or type those things should be displayed in their completeness, which are afterwards to be transferred in their degree to the transmitted forms which are derived from it. Therefore, in Christ's manhood dwelt the fulness of grace, as the plenitude of nature in Adam. For what reach of observation could be wanting to him to whom the knowledge of all animal life was intuitive; and what power of intellect could be deficient in him, in whom the gift of language was an original endowment! The words of the poet do but go along with our natural feeling—

"Adam the goodliest of his sons since born."

And the records of antiquity express the same conviction, for "Seth and Sem were in great honour among men, and so was Adam above every living thing in the creation."[2] If we look

[1] "Πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἡ θεία καταβέβηκε χάρις, ὑψοῦσα καὶ ἁγιάζουσα καὶ δοξάζουσα καὶ θεοποιοῦσα τὴν φύσιν ἐν πρώτῳ Χριστῷ."—*S. Cyril Thesaurus*, xx. vol. v. p. 197.

[2] Ecclesiasticus xlix. 16.

accordingly to the mere gift of physical strength, we find him to have withstood, longer than any other who is on record, the approach of bodily decay. Taking sixty-five as the period of that ripeness of age in which Adam was created—and none of the antediluvian Patriarchs became more early a father—Adam's life would be equivalent to nearly one thousand years. Thus was nature set forth in its perfectness in a single type, before it was multiplied in its feebler possessors.

But far more is the same principle exhibited in the Kingdom of Grace. "For if through the offence of one many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." It was to set forth a perfect pattern of renewed humanity that Our Lord became incarnate, "for with power He created the world, but restored it by obedience." By this means was perfected that example of human nature which from the time of its conception was without weakness or defilement. But this perfection it had, not like Adam from the mere absence of guilt, but from the presence of that Deity with which it was personally one. That exhaustless grace, which was to be the principle of life to the whole renewed family, had its fountain and well-head in the manhood of the Son of God, before it was portioned out to the innumerable generations of His spiritual progeny. And thus "being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." To this end was His man's nature so sorely exercised, that it might be the seed of life to all His members. So much He Himself tells us respecting His human nature, declaring that He purified it, that it might be a fit source of grace for all men: "For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth." And this sanctifying truth is no other than that Divine Being, who applies the virtue of His own manhood to His servants: "Sanctify them through Thy Truth, Thy Word is truth." So that by union with His humanity does He bestow upon all the members in their degree, that which pertains

perfectly to the Head of the body by nature. As St. Athanasius expresses it, the Eternal "Word was not weakened by taking a body, as though for Himself He needed to receive grace, but rather He deified that which He put on—nay, He graciously bestowed it upon the family of men."[1] Thus did His humanity become "the leaven of the whole lump," that through itself it might "sanctify the whole race of man."[2] It was the city set on a hill,[3] in which all the kindred of the renewed are inhabitants. For this reason is "the fellowship of the Holy Ghost" the very consummation of the Church's blessing, as implying that through His power all renewed men have communion with the body of Christ and with one another. "Through spiritual food," says St. Leo, "is this blessing received and taken, so that by that heavenly nourishment we are transformed into the very flesh of Him who by His Incarnation adopted ours."[4] It seems scarcely needful to put in the caution, that the benefits of election to be one with Christ are forfeited by those whose individual will is not conformed to the influence of the Divine nature. The caution, however, is well expressed in a passage ascribed [unduly] to St. Cyprian: "The Sacraments in themselves cannot lose their virtue, nor does the Divine majesty withdraw itself in any way from its mysteries. But though the Sacraments allow themselves to be taken and handled by unworthy men, yet such persons cannot be partakers of the Spirit. Therefore are these gifts the savour of life to one, of death to another."[5] What is needful therefore is expressed by the holy Apostle: seeing that "our life is hid with Christ in God," let us "kill our members which are upon the earth," that "when Christ which is" our "life shall appear," we "also may appear with Him in glory."

The necessity then of Christ's Presence according to His

[1] *Con. Arian.* i. 42.
[2] S. Gregor. Naz. *Hom.* xxxvi. 89.
[3] St. Hilary, on Matt. iv. 12, p. 624.
[4] St. Leo, quoted in Poynet's *Diallact.* p. 101.
[5] *De Cœna Domini.*

humanity, rests upon His being that Pattern man, in whom renewed manhood shone forth in its brightest colours, by reason of those supernatural endowments with which it was invested. So that it is essential that we should be as truly united to Him by grace, as we were to the first Adam by nature. And this supernatural perfection of the human character was set forth in His whole earthly pilgrimage. If Adam showed the strength of our nature by multitude of days, the new man "in a few years fulfilled a long life." His childhood was "wiser than His teachers;" as He passed through every age, He sanctified each;[1] He glorified every relation of man's life; and purified that material world which man had polluted.[2] Was there in Adam the undiminished strength of natural life—in the man Christ there was the gift "to have life in Himself," even for the quickening of others. His miracles were but the outbreak of that innate vitality which will quicken the bodies of all men at the Last Day. Diseases, those mimic likenesses of death, fled before Him even in His passage through the world: "I must do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected." This mastery over the enemies of life was a natural indication that in Him was its principle of conservation. And even more wide than the rational kingdom was His exercise of power, as though, perhaps, to harmonize with that mysterious law which has bound man to the inferior as well as the superior creation, and which shows the relation which matter has to mind. Those miracles which are least accordant with our

[1] S. Iren. ii. 22, 4; iii. 18, 7. S. Greg. vol. iii. pt. 2, p. 6.

[2] "Our conception being the root (as it were), the very groundsill of our nature—that He might go to the root, and repair our nature from the very foundation, thither He went: that what had been there defiled and decayed by the first Adam, might by the second be cleansed and set right again. He was not idle all the nine months He was in the womb; but then and there He even ate out the core of corruption that cleft to our nature and us, and made both us and it an unpleasing object in the sight of God. And what came of this? We that were abhorred by God were by this means made *beloved in Him.* He cannot, we may be sure, account evil of that nature, that is now become the nature of His own Son—His now no less than ours."—*Bishop Andrews's Sermon* ix. *on the Nativity.*

expectation, such as affected the animal or vegetable world,[1] may have been designed to prove that, as corruption can spread upwards from the lower forms of being, even till it mingle itself with the life of man, so in Him was there a contrary principle, which could spread downwards from its seat of empire into the lowest stages of existence, and which (though used indeed for purposes of punishment) would not be less powerful to preserve than to destroy.

And now, therefore, may we draw the conclusion to which this whole Chapter conducts us, and affirm that Our Lord's acts of Mediation towards men, as well as His intercession with the Father, are a present fact in the world of life, and not a mere fictitious representation. To be accounted the bond of union between different natures is to discharge the part of a Mediator —to be their real bond of union is to *be* one. Now, Christ did not undertake this office as a legal fiction; He is the "One Mediator," because in Him Godhead and Manhood were really united. And if He has still the same character, it must be in fact and not in name—Godhead and Manhood must still be connected by His actual intervention. While He is one by nature with the Everlasting Father, He must be one also by grace with those inferior members to whom He has vouchsafed to become Head, that He might be the "Saviour of the body." For the gifts of grace do not become less necessary through the lapse of ages: every generation of Adam's children has equal need of that external principle of supernatural renewal, which flows from the humanity of the Son of God into His brethren. The acts of His human must continue therefore as certainly as those of His Divine nature, and consequently that Presence of His manhood, whereby "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." Thus does the truth of His Mediation imply our actual union with His man's nature. We may employ the argument by which St. Paul shows that the intrusion of the Jewish Law could not supersede the more comprehensive

[1] St. Matthew viii. 32; xxi. 19.

Covenant which had been already pledged to Abraham. "A mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Mediation *i.e.* implies of necessity the presence of two parties; if God's holy nature consents to be joined to ours, the very terms imply that the actual union of our inferior being must be included. So that if Christ be still Mediator, there must be the perpetual presence among us of His man's nature, whereby He who is one with the Father becomes one also with His brethren. The chain is not complete, unless as certain as His union with the one is His communion with the other. And if this truth be forgotten, there awaits us the danger of those two alternate heresies, between which, no less than in ancient days, the Church's doctrine is our road of safety. For if Christ's manhood be not truly present with us, then does our reference to Him become a mere union with Deity at large, and not a specific relation to Him who was crucified. And why can it be thought that He whom we serve does not now employ towards us the intervention of man's nature, save because it is maintained that He does not now *act* as man—is not as really man, as He was in the days of His humiliation? His manhood is supposed to be something which we read of in books, and remember as a proof of His condescension, but which is not now acting upon us through the world of spirit. And what then must be thought of that body which suffered on the Cross, but that either it was a created substance, invested by God's mercy with more than mortal power and goodness, that it might accomplish that sacrifice which was needed for mankind—which is the Arian hypothesis—or else that the Father of all displayed Himself in man's form by a transient and occasional manifestation, and (that work being over) has again retreated into the abyss of His unapproachable Godhead? And this is the more subtile heresy of Sabellius. On either hypothesis Christ might indeed be nominally an object of worship, because set forth by the Eternal Father as an image (p. 114) in which man might reverence His perfections, as the heathen adored the

representations of their gods. But the worship which on the Arian or Sabellian supposition is due to Christ, would only be that secondary honour which was assigned Him by the will and appointment of the Father—not such primary allegiance as is due by nature to the co-equal image of God. So that He who in the body of a man suffered on the Cross, would not be the very same Being who reigns by His own right in heaven. And thus the reality of our Lord's Mediation would be lost. For this depends on that personal diversity in the Ever-Blessed Trinity which allows of a personal union between God and man. Unless this be conceded, He who died for us on the Cross is not truly the self-same Being who makes intercession for us in heaven. "It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." This truth is our only safeguard, as well against the refined infidelity of an intellectual heathenism, as against the superstition of a vulgar idolatry. For to what would the Arian supposition lead men, save to trust in the Mediation of a created being, and thus to reverence the creature rather than the Creator? And this was the very stain of Pagan worship. And what is the tendency of Sabellian error, save to lose sight of any mode of Mediation, and in the pride of intellect to betake itself to the abstract contemplation of God? And the result in this case would be the bare Theism of the philosophic, or the dreamy Pantheism of the poetic mind. Against such errors, then, the Church opposes that truth of Christ's Presence as man, which results from the reality of a Divine Mediator. Christ is truly present with His people both as God and man: the Presence of the one nature is secured by the power of the other. Thus has man's nature been raised above itself, because endowed in His Person with a grace which is supernatural. And, therefore, can the child of the Church Catholic look with confidence in the hour of trial to the Presence of its Head. His supplications are not offered to any created Mediator, nor yet to any mere Spirit of the Universe—an indefinite abstraction of fancy—for God is

in Christ, reconciling to Himself the world. To Him can prayer ascend with confidence :—Come, Thou Lord of life, Thou lover of souls, in the truth of Thy man's nature, with the perfectness of Thy man's sympathy, come and join Thyself to my soul, that I also may be joined for ever to Thee. "As for me, I will behold Thy presence in righteousness, and when I awake up after Thy likeness, I shall be satisfied with it."

CHAPTER XI.

CHRIST IS PRESENT WITH MEN IN HIS CHURCH OR BODY MYSTICAL.

The nature and importance of Christ's presence have been exhibited in the preceding Chapter. He is present with His people through His man's nature ; not, however, by material contact, but by spiritual power. And through this Presence does He act as the Head of the renewed race—as the second Adam of restored humanity. The question which next suggests itself is, by what means man may profit through this great blessing ; how each individual may obtain a part in that work of Mediation, which was wrought in Expiation on the Cross ; which is still discharged by Intercession in heaven ; and whose sphere of operation is as extensive as that Presence upon earth, which the God-man vouchsafes through spiritual power. For this end something is wanting plainly on our part, as well as something on the part of God. But the qualifications which are required on our part—the efficacy of faith, the importance of love—will not be touched upon in this place, because they belong to a different inquiry. For these pertain to man, who is the subject in whom religious feelings exist ; though they be God's gift yet they are a gift which exists within and not without us ; their nature and importance follow from consideration of our inward constitution. On the circumstance that each man has a true personal exist-

ence, and that to each is committed the awful power of choosing or refusing Christ, depends the necessity of individual faith and love for each man's salvation. But on this question we are not at present occupied: what is said here refers to what is done without, not to what is done within us; to Christ as a real being external to our thoughts, as the object of our faith who exists outside of our minds. For it was at first proposed to treat the *objective* not the *subjective* part of religion; not to inquire what changes were necessary in man, who is the *subject* of religion, but to show that there was an *object* above and around man, the reality of whose existence it was essential to believe. This object is Christ our Lord: "Christ who died, yea, rather who is risen from the dead, who is also at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." And since His Intercession and the Presence of His man's nature are realities existing outside of ourselves—not mere fancies, but actual objects external to us—it is necessary to ask in what way these general advantages are so consigned to individuals that they may be the separate portion of single souls. The question is, not what is necessary on our part, whether faith or love, but what is the condition or quality in these external realities themselves, which renders them available for our individual apprehension.

Now, on this subject it may be said in general, that our union with the manhood of Christ, or our participation in His Presence, is brought about in our union with the Church, which is His body mystical. It is not that one of these is a means or channel through which we approach the other, but that since the two processes are identical it is impossible to divide them. For that which joins men to Christ's mystical body the Church, is their union with His man's nature; and their means of union with His man's nature is bestowed in His Church or body mystical. This will become more evident, when it is shown that the Sacraments, which are the means of binding us to the mystical body of Christ, derive their efficacy from the influence of His body natural. And hence the impossibility of answering

a question which is sometimes asked, whether men are joined to Christ by being joined to His Church, or joined to His Church by being joined to Him. It would be a parallel question to ask, whether we were sharers in Adam's nature because we were men, or men because we were sharers in Adam's nature. The two relations hang inseparably together. By the mystical body of Christ, is meant the whole family of those who by the Holy Ghost are united in Church ordinances to His man's nature. Our real union with each is what gives us a part in the other.

This intimacy of union between Christ and the Church may be gathered in the first place from the direct words of Scripture. Why should the Church be called a body, and especially why should it be called the body of Christ, did not some relation bind it to that body of Christ, which came into existence at His Incarnation? It may be answered, that the Church is spoken of as a body, because thought of as a whole through the abstracting power of reason. Yet why should it be called the body of the Lord? The subjects of an earthly Prince might be spoken of as making up together the body of his realm, but who would call them the body of their King? Yet such language is repeatedly employed, and under various forms, respecting Christians in Holy Scripture. The harmony of its metaphorical expressions implies that they rest upon some real relation. When Christ declares Himself the Vine, and His people the branches, this is because the trees of the field have an organized life. If the Church is His bride, this is because the marriage bond savours so strongly of an actual union. So that a real and not merely a metaphorical conjunction must be designed, when we read, "ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

Now, since the mention of "body" leads us plainly to the human part of Our Lord's being (for God is a spirit), therefore whatever relation is implied in the application of this term to the Church, must plainly connect it with Our Lord's human nature. And the manner in which St. Paul transfers what is

applicable to Our Lord's actual body to His body mystical, implies that the one of these is truly dependent on the other. Thus does the natural affection which each man bears to himself, pass on into Our Lord's affection to His people : "No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. For we are members of His body ; of His flesh, and of His bones." "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." And, therefore, He is "the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands" has "nourishment ministered." And so identified are the man Christ Jesus and His spiritual members, that the name which belongs individually to Him, is used for them in their collective character. Hence He who, as the Apostle tells us, "gave gifts unto men," was Himself, as the Psalmist expresses it, their receiver. When St. Paul is arguing that the promise to Abraham was not pledged to all the races which descended from him, but to one only of the families of which he was parent, he comprehends the spiritual progeny of Abraham under the name of Christ :[1] "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also is Christ." It seems unquestionable, therefore, that some real relation must bind together that body natural which He took by His Incarnation, and His body mystical the Church, so that our union with the one must be a ground of union with the other.[2]

[1] Vide supra, p. 19. The same interpretation is given to Galatians iii. 16, by St. Augustin on Psalm cxlii. 3.

[2] "The Church is in Christ, as Eve was in Adam. Yea by grace we are every of us in Christ and in His Church, as by nature we are in those our first parents. God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And His Church He frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man. His body crucified and His blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elements of that heavenly being, which maketh us such as Himself is, of whom we come. For which cause the words of Adam may be fitly the words of Christ concerning His Church, 'flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bones,' a true native extract out of mine own body. So that in Him, even according to His manhood, we, according to our heavenly being, are as branches in that root out of which they grow." —*Eccles. Pol.* v. 56, 7.

The intimate connexion by which the natural body of Christ is bound to His body mystical, becomes still more evident if we advert to one peculiar characteristic, which the one derives from the other. What is the cause and import of that unity of the Church, which is directly asserted in Holy Writ, and which has been delivered to us as so fundamental a doctrine of our faith, as to be made an Article of the Creed? "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." Unless St. Paul's words are to go for nothing, there must plainly be some reason why this unity in the Church's external form is put forth in so emphatic a manner. Or again, "we, being many, are one body in Christ." And this unity of the Church's body has in all ages been esteemed essential to Christian belief. The assertion of it, as an original Article of the Creed, is the testimony of that universal community, which Christ Our Lord promised to guard from fatal error. It would have been to corrupt the principles of the Gospel, if the collective voice of Christians had proclaimed among its fundamental verities what was either false or futile. Yet if the unity of the Church were nothing but that those who bear the same name may be classed together, as we bestow the name of Platonists on those who followed the disciple of Socrates, its assertion as a doctrine would be altogether unmeaning. But suppose that something further is designed: on what can it be dependent? Was it merely an arbitrary rule, imposed as a technical restraint upon the extension of the Christian body? Could it be meant to shackle its advance by subjecting it to such restricting conditions as at present interfere with the growth of the Church of Christ, in many countries where it receives State assistance? If such a thing could be thought possible, yet the absence of any original rules for the Church's general government, shows that it was not attempted. By a noiseless and simultaneous growth did it spring up like Solomon's temple in the beauty of holiness, till it filled the mighty precincts of the Roman Empire. For three centuries at least, there was no reference for purposes of

government to any earthly head, while yet the Church's body seemed as though it were instinct with a single soul. From whence could come this marvellous co-operation! Its inconsistency with the acts of men bespeaks at once its Divine parentage. The Church is *one* because it is the body of Christ, and because it is quickened by His Spiritual Presence. Through spiritual life does His Body natural act upon mankind, and become germinant of that which is called His Body Mystical, from its relation to Himself. It was predicted that "He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." In this manner it was that He should "divide the spoil with the strong." Thus has God made Him "the firstborn among many brethren." Christ's Humanity, that stone[1] cut out of the mine of man's nature without his co-operation, has swelled up into a mountain. Its cementing principle is that quickening influence of the second man, by which He lives in all His members. Thus do they trace to Christ's manhood their spiritual life, as to Adam their natural parentage.[2]

We need not wonder then that the Church's unity is declared to be a fact, and that its confession is a fundamental doctrine. That the Church is one body results from organization, not from enactment; it is Christ's body, wrought out through the sacrifice of that manhood, which He offered on the Cross. From the oneness of His body which is slain, results the oneness of His body which is sanctified. Neither is the profession of the Church's unity the mere admission of an external appearance,

[1] Vid. S. Aug. in *Joann. Trac.* iv. 4. St. Basil on *Isaiah*, cap. vii. vol. i. p. 604.

[2] "The only sure anchor of all our hopes for a joyful resurrection unto the life of glory, is the mystical union which must be wrought here on earth betwixt Christ's human nature glorified, and our mortal and dissoluble nature. The Divine nature, indeed, is the prime fountain of life to all, but though inexhaustible in itself, yet a fountain whereof we cannot drink, save as it is derived unto us through the human nature of Christ."—*Jackson's Comment on Creed*, xi. 3, 10.

but the belief in an inward verity. It is to recognize the presence of that spiritual power, which spreads itself from Christ Our Lord throughout all members of His mystical body. In this presence consists their life: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." From this central source, then, flows all the life of renewed humanity. And that its being and harmony might have their origin in the highest of all perfections, and be truly the reflection upon earth of what is heavenly and divine, therefore its principle of connexion is a counterpart here below of that primary union which existed before all creation, and which is the grand type and cause of concord and law. For the Mediator promised to be in His servants, even as He Himself is the seat of that mysterious indwelling of the Eternal Father, whereby the whole Blessed Trinity is united in the never-ending perfection of an actual oneness: "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." And again, "that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us." Not, of course, that we can speak of that union in which men partake, as the same with that ineffable union which binds together those Three Blessed Persons who are numerically one.[1] We can affirm only that the union in Christ which exists among men, has borrowed something from the ineffable union of the Divine nature.[2] As the perfection of God's Being is the true cause and source of everything perfect which the world exhibits, so in the oneness of the renewed family in Christ we discern traces of that mysterious unity which underlies all things. "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." And therefore "our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ."

[1] Vide Fourth Lateran Council, Can. ii.—*Hard.* vol. vii. p. 18.
[2] St. Ambrose, *De Fide*, iv. 10, 128.

For the whole Three Persons of the Blessed Godhead take part in that work of mercy for which the Mediator became Incarnate. For the Holy Ghost, as St. Augustin expresses it, "acts through the whole Church, as the soul in all the members of one body."[1] And "the Father Himself loveth you"; while the Son is "Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Thus does unity stoop down from the higher to the lower nature, and the Church on Earth is the true and real manifestation of the Kingdom of Heaven. Not that our union in spirit with God has superseded or taken the place of that personal oneness, whereby in Christ Our Lord the manhood is united to God. This were the Sabellian heresy, which would represent the Deity as manifesting Himself only in three relations, whereof each succeeded and superseded its predecessor. For the union of Godhead with manhood in Christ, is a real, perfect, and lasting union, of which the union of Christ with men is the appointed effect. So that these mysterious relations are cumulative and not consequent only, leading down by successive steps to things on earth from things in heaven.[2]

Thus does the impulsive wave of heavenly concord extend itself to the race of man, from its primary source in the bosom of incommunicable Godhead. To assert the truth of Christ's Presence—the reality of that union which binds the whole mystic body of His Church to the manhood of the Incarnate

[1] Sermo cclxvii. 4.

[2] This wonderful chain of connection is set forth by Lord Bacon in his Confession of Faith: "The Word did not only take flesh, or was joined to flesh, but was made flesh, though without confusion of substance or nature: so as the Eternal Son of God and the Ever-Blessed Son of Mary was one Person—so one, as the Blessed Virgin may be truly and catholically called *Deipara*, the Mother of God—so one, as there is no unity in universal nature, not that of the soul and body of man so perfect: for the Three Heavenly Unities, whereof that is the second, exceed all natural unities; that is, the unity of the Three Persons in the Godhead; the unity of God and man in Christ; and the unity of Christ and the Church—the Holy Ghost being the worker of both these latter unities; for by the Holy Ghost was Christ Incarnate, and quickened in flesh; and by the Holy Ghost was man regenerated and quickened in the spirit."—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 123.

Word—is to maintain the reality of His Mediation, and the absolute necessity of that bond by which heaven and earth are united. For it is a necessary result of the cardinal truth of the Christian system—the truth, *i.e.*, that all gifts and blessings are introduced into our race through the intervention of that nobler member, who connects it with the Almighty. And herein is the Christian scheme of Mediation opposed to that theory of Rationalism, which rests upon the capacities of nature. The principle of Rationalism is, that man's improvement may be effected through those gifts which God bestowed upon him by creation, inasmuch as sufficient means of intercourse with the Supreme Spirit were provided by the law of his nature. Whereas the Church deals with man as a fallen race, whose original means of intercourse with God have been obstructed, and which needs a new and supernatural channel for the entrance of heavenly gifts. And this channel has been provided through the Man Jesus Christ. In His person did Godhead enter manhood, that through this one perfect type of humanity, it might "leaven the whole lump." Thus does the law of grace supersede the law of nature. If man had never fallen, to inherit the nature of the first Adam had been a sufficient means of communion with God. But because the natural means of communication have been cut off, that supernatural union is requisite which we obtain by participating the nature of the second Adam. Now, it is for the diffusion of this renewed and renewing manhood, that those media have been provided, whereby the Son of Man communicates Himself to His brethren. All the ordinances of the Church, its hallowed things, places, and persons—its worship and Sacraments—are a series of instruments whereby the sanctified manhood of the Mediator diffuses itself as a life-giving seed through the mass of humanity. Thus does He continue to effect that work through His man's nature, which He avowed to be the very object of His earthly being: "for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth." And for this office are external media as

requisite, as were body and limbs to the truth of His human being. As He could not be a man without that substantial existence which revealed Him to the senses of mankind, so He could not be the Head of the Body Mystical, without the use of those actual media of intercourse, whereby He unites His living Members to Himself.

The importance, then, of external ordinances results from that fact on which Christianity is dependent, that through the Incarnation of the Mediator, the corrupted race of man has been regenerated by a heavenly nature. Yet this gracious provision is often received with repugnance by those for whose benefit it is intended. Many who are called Christians, and who profess to value above all things the Mediation of Christ, consider themselves actually injured, because this "new and living way" has been opened to them "through the veil, that is to say His flesh." The opportunity of approaching God through the Man Christ Jesus, which is given to them through the ordinances of His mystic body, seems an encroachment on that right of access which they before had, through the free exercise of their own thoughts. Before a country is marked out by roads, any one may make his own way through woods and over commons to the royal dwelling; but the institution of highways abridges the previous liberty of approach. This seems to be the feeling of many in regard to the Mediation of Christ. They wish to approach God in their own way, as mind speaks to mind, without resorting to that circuitous method, which requires their union with the Church. But the appointment of a Mediator with the Father does not diminish men's means of access, unless the opportunity of approach, which existed before, is denied them. Now, since the Gospel is offered only to those to whom it is communicated (for "how shall they hear without a preacher?"), the condition of persons to whom Mediation is unknown remains unaffected by its announcement. Wherever graces appear in the children of men, we know that they come down only from the "Father of Lights," and we rejoice that

"Light can find its way
To regions furthest from the fount of day."

Such influence was visible in former times among men who were blinded by ignorance, and it may be found at present among men who are blinded by prejudice. And yet it is impossible to deny that those who reject the Doctrine of Mediation, now that it is revealed, are in danger of rejecting Christ. For what is their conduct in reality but the very crime which is forbidden in the Second Commandment? The First Commandment inhibited the substitution of other gods, Baal or Ashtaroth, in place of Jehovah. The Second forbade to worship Jehovah in other ways than that which was "ordained by Angels in the hand of a Mediator." It was the place of this Mediator, Moses, which the Golden Calf was intended to supply. The crime of Israel was that when the Most High had appointed a mode of access, men thought that they could approach Him better through their own inventions. And what else is the result, when men think that they can reach over the God-man, the one channel of intercourse between earth and heaven, and address themselves by a shorter and more direct approach to God? This course may be adopted without professed disbelief in Christ, if men neglect that channel of approach which He has opened to the Father. For the notion of communing with God, the Eternal and Infinite Spirit, through the immediate action of our own spirits, independently of that mode of coming to Him which has been provided through the manhood of Christ, tends to a denial of the whole principle of His Mediation. What does it matter whether men call the object of their worship Christ, and profess belief in Him, if the only thing to which they direct their thoughts is the ultimate and incommunicable Godhead? What more remarkably distinguishes the Mediator from the Father, and the Holy Ghost than that they are *not*, whereas He *is*, personally united to manhood? So that in approaching Him we cannot overpass His man's nature—it is our natural channel of communion with Him. What is addressed directly by man's

spirit to the Ultimate Spirit of the Universe, is not addressed to Christ, or if addressed to Him in name, it is not addressed to Him as Mediator, but only through His general participation in the nature of Godhead.

Here, then, lies the error of those who, like the Quakers, reject, or at least undervalue those external means, whereby the Son of Man unites Himself to His spiritual members. The disuse of Sacraments is only one point in that general system which looks rather to the actings of our own mind than to the agency of an Incarnate Mediator. Now, without judging individuals who must stand or fall to their own master, it may safely be affirmed that the ultimate tendency of this system, however it may retain the phraseology of the Gospel, is to substitute natural religion for revealed. Our irresistible conviction respecting the acting of spirits leads us to conclude that the thought, wish, and conviction of our own minds is at all times present as an object to the all-wise Spirit of God. Do our souls then desire to hold intercourse with the great primary Spirit of the Universe, there needs, so far as nature tells us, no intervening link: that which exists as an intellectual reality in us, is a real object to the knowledge of the Most High. But to build on such intercourse as this, is to rest only on those principles which belong to us by creation. It is to employ mere natural means for intercourse with God. So that to make it an objection against the Church system, that its media of communion are not simple, natural, and immediate—that they do not commend themselves to human judgment, but tax our faith, and introduce something external between us and God—is in reality to complain that the system of nature has been superseded by the system of Mediation. For when Christ's manhood was made a bridge[1] between heaven and earth, whereby the purity and exaltation of the Divine nature might be brought into contact with the infirmity and defilement of ours, an external channel

[1] "Σὺ, ὁ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν γεφυρώσας τῷ ἁγίῳ σοῦ σώματι."—*S. Greg. Thaum. in Pet. de Inc.* ii. 9, 3.

of communication was substituted for the immediate intercourse of mind with mind. So long as man's mind speaks immediately to the Universal Mind which pervades all things, its inner actions are realities in themselves, which are contemplated at once by the Supreme Essence; but if there be a Being external to us, through whom all intercourse must pass—a single Being, characterized by all the reality which depends on material existence—then must something be superadded to those mere inward actions of faith and love, which are all that nature could point out as the means of intercourse between one spirit and another. This new medium of intercourse, this channel of communication between earth and heaven, has been provided exclusively by *His* gift, who of His free mercy undertook to be Mediator between God and Man. The road of access which is opened to us in the system of the Church's ordinances is not in any degree of our making: we need to use, but we do not contribute at all to prepare it. The work of Mediation is Christ's work from beginning to end: when He took our nature He did it by actual union—when He joins His members to Himself, they are really, though by immaterial and spiritual influence, engrafted into His purified humanity. His members have actually "put on the new man," and "as many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ."

It would be unjust, of course, to attribute to the whole body of Quakers any conscious design of rejecting Christ: their notion no doubt is that He is present, to their thoughts, and in this way they suppose that they make Him their means of access. But this is to forget that the principle of His Mediation is not that His man's nature is the ultimate object of worship, but that it is the sole road of approach to the Father. His Manhood is "the door" through which we are admitted to His Godhead. When the Church system is opposed to that of Rationalism, the actions of His Manhood are in reality opposed to those of our own spirits. The channel of union which has been provided through grace is opposed to that which existed by nature. What is needed,

therefore, is some real agency on His part, whereby this merciful intervention may be effected. He must actually stretch forth the hand of His humanity towards us, before we can effectually stretch forth the hand of faith towards Him. Adam is not merely an object to men's thoughts, like the Angels of God: he is bound to his descendants by the true but unknown tie of paternity: if Christ our Mediator be the second Adam, there must be as real an influence, by which all His members must hold to *His* man's nature. And if this union is not brought about, as Rationalists suppose, through those means which had their existence through Creation, it must be effected through media which are beside and foreign to nature. That spiritual power, whereby His humanity becomes the seminal principle of His body mystical, must act through such supernatural agency as it pleases Him to adopt. So that the ancient writers, as Bishop Taylor says, speak of "the Blessed Sacrament" as "the extension of the Incarnation." No wonder, then, that in the palmy days of the Quaker sect, when its principles were fully developed, their denial of those ordinances whereby the God-man discharges His office of Mediation should have led them into expressions[1] inconsistent with any belief in His real existence. The characteristic doctrine of the Gospel, that God and man were permanently made one in the Person of Christ, was superseded by a dreamy notion of the abstract intercourse between the minds of faithful men, and the governing Mind of the Universe. The tendency of such a system is to substitute Rationalism for the Gospel; in place, that is, of the Revelation through a Mediator, to fall back upon the universal revelation of nature. And since the Doctrine of the Incarnation for the first time revealed the personal character of God, Rationalism itself is but the entrance to that deeper abyss of Pantheism, towards which the rejection of the Sacramental system has a tendency to conduct.

[1] "George Fox says that if there be any other Christ but He that was crucified within, He is the false Christ. This Christ that was risen and crucified within—devils and reprobates make a talk of Him without."—*Leslie's Snake in the Grass, &c.*, sec. 10, p. 67.

The custom, therefore, of putting inward acts of faith and love in place of those external means whereby Christ vouchsafes to join men to His manhood, is in reality to make these the channel of mediation instead of Him ; it is to set up idols in our hearts, and thank them for our deliverance from the house of bondage. Those who do not go so far as directly to abandon the appointed means of grace, must be on their guard lest a measure of the same evil should be incurred by undervaluing them.[1] For whatever derogates from the Sacramental system, has the effect of depreciating that union with God which we have by grace, and therefore of casting us on that union which existed by nature. This is the virtual tendency, when inward seriousness—the necessity of which in itself cannot be too earnestly maintained—is supposed to dispense with those external means whereby Christ allies Himself to His members. The remark applies of course not to those

[1] An instance may be afforded by the ordinance of Confirmation. Among its benefits must be ranked the opportunity afforded, at a most critical period of life, for confirming the promises of childhood. Such an act, conscientiously discharged, in the presence of many witnesses, has no little tendency to strengthen good resolutions; and since all good acts must be suggested as well as favoured by God, we may safely speak of the inward resolution as dependent on His spiritual succour. Now, this account of Confirmation, if regarded as a partial view of the service, would be fitting enough; but if considered to be the whole of its benefits, it would resolve an ordinance of the Gospel into a mere Rationalistic act. For, according to this view of things, the candidates come to confirm themselves in the Bishop's presence [or, perhaps to confirm the Bishop in the belief of their good intentions], instead of being brought, as the Prayer-book directs, "*to be confirmed by him.*" The sole object is the ratification of their vows; the added assurance of their intention to perform what at Baptism was promised. The efficacy of the service rests altogether upon the acceptableness of their previous prayers, and the sincerity of their present purpose, which, according to God's natural mode of dealing with men, are met by a corresponding blessing. What converts this act of natural religion into a Christian rite is, that through the instrumentality of His minister, the New Head of man's race receives His younger members into closer union, and *confirms* those graces, which at Baptism have already flowed into them from Himself. Thus is a natural mode of converse with God exalted into a means of supernatural union. Unless this truth be admitted, unless Christ be discerned to be truly present through the agency of His servants, to bless in the laying on of hands, and to communicate through external means that supernatural life, of which His humanity is the source, wherein does this act differ from any other, whereby responsible agents pledge themselves to serve God, and what especial benefit is there in Christian Confirmation?

who are debarred the use of such means, but to those by whom they are deemed superfluous. It was a sublime exhortation of the ancient Platonist, "to fly to the solitary Deity in the solitude of our own spirit." But that which in a Heathen was a pious reaching forth after light, would be an impious rejection of it in a Christian. For that which renders man's responsibility so great, is the greatness of the gift which is offered to his acceptance. To careless men this is the great argument against the Church system: they would rather live at a lower stage of accountableness—they shrink with horror from the real indwelling of this Holy God. But it will be otherwise with devout minds. Let them once feel the reality of Christ's Presence, and they will not again take up with a religion of shadows. All which is needful for such persons, is to understand that to admit the Church or Sacramental system, is only to believe the reality of those acts whereby the God-man discharges His work of Mediation. However jealous they are of the formalism of their own hearts, and however watchful against spiritual carelessness, they cannot be afraid of resting too much on the Mediation of Christ, and of esteeming too highly His Presence by the Spirit. For the Holy Ghost, as He came at Pentecost with power, and as His dealings by grace are discriminated from the general actings of the Great Spirit of the Universe, has a peculiar function and office in the Gospel Covenant. And since it has been His will that those gracious strivings whereby He renews all hearts should be consequent on the Mediation of Christ, therefore to leave out of account that perfect manhood whereby the new Head of our race acts upon His members, is to dispense also with the specific operations of the Blessed Comforter. So that the whole system of Mediation would be passed by in this method of approach, as though the spirit of man could by direct, self-originating, immediate impulse commune with the Almighty. If men say, that what they trust is not their own spirit, but something bestowed upon them by God, yet still it is something within themselves—something,

"Which if Heaven gave it, may be termed their own."

For they look to some chain of intercourse, which, starting from themselves, communicates directly with the Most High. What is this in truth but to fall back upon those endowments of man's spirit which he has by creation—upon the natural powers of the soul—and thus to pass by Christ the Mediator in our access to God! "There were of the old Valentinian Heretics," says Hooker, "some, which had knowledge in such admiration, that to it they ascribed all, and so despised the Sacraments of Christ, pretending that as ignorance had made us subject to all misery, so the full redemption of the inward man, and the work of our restoration, must needs belong unto *knowledge* only. They draw very near unto this error who, fixing wholly their minds on the known necessity of faith, imagine that nothing but faith is necessary for the attainment of all grace." [1] "We are to believe and acknowledge that as God the Father doth neither forgive nor vouchsafe reconciliation, but for the merits and satisfaction of His only Son; so neither will He vouchsafe to convey this or any other blessing unto us, which His Son hath purchased for us, but only through His Son: not only through Him as our Advocate or Intercessor, but through Him as our Mediator—that is, through His humanity, as the organ or conduit, or as the only bond by which we are united and reconciled unto the Divine nature." [2]

The views of these two great writers, always esteemed among the highest authorities in the English Church, have been strikingly illustrated since they wrote, by some circumstances in the history of the sect which has been referred to. In the case of the Quakers, whose opinions were avowed with greater consistency than is found in many of their partisans, may be seen by what sure steps a forgetfulness of Our Lord's office as Mediator, and of those Sacramental ordinances, whereby He unites men to Himself, leads persons who least design it to errors respecting His nature. If this result is not always reached, it is because those who live in the atmosphere of a Christian country, derive

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 60, 4. [2] Jackson's *Comm. on the Creed*, xi. 3, 12.

a large portion of their opinions from the standard which obtains around them. No one seems to have less anticipated such consequences than George Fox, when he first yielded to the impulse to head a party. It was among the fermentations which issued in the Great Rebellion, when, as he complained in his last moments, "the outward Christians" were "broken up into many sects,"[1] that he was impelled to look within himself for the principle of unity. The times peculiarly inclined earnest men to such a course. Never was religion more overlaid by hypocrisy, or truth more lost in contentiousness. The Puritan Divines had explained away the meaning of Gospel ordinances, while they insisted zealously on their formal observance. Now, it is so contrary to the genius of Christianity, to attach primary weight to what is purely technical, that Fox[2]

[1] Sewel's *History of Friends*, vol. ii. p. 492.

[2] Fox's mode of argument was the same with that of all persons who deny that God's grace is a guide to the collective Body of Christ—a firm persuasion, namely, that it was vouchsafed to himself in preference to others. "As he was walking in a field on a First-day morning, it was discovered unto his understanding, that to be bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to make a man to be a minister of Christ. At this he wondered, because it was the common belief of people; but for all this, he took this to be a Divine revelation, and he admired the goodness of the Lord, believing now the ordinary ministers not to be such as they pretended to be. This made him unwilling to go any more to Church."—*Sewel's History*, i. p. 17. He now threw himself with effect on that principle of sympathy, which is equally conducive to the growth of truth, or the extension of error; and which renders earnestness and confidence no less contagious than bodily diseases. At Sedberg "he preached for several hours, showing that the Lord was come to teach His people Himself, and to bring them off from all the world's ways and teachers to Christ, the true teacher and the true way to God. Moreover, he showed the declining state of the modern doctors and teachers, and exhorted the people to come off from the temples made with hands, and wait to receive the Spirit of the Lord, that they might know themselves to be the temples of God." "Having refreshed himself at noon with a little water out of a brook, he went and sat down on the top of a rock hard by the chapel, intending to have a meeting there. At this people wondered, because they looked upon the Church as a holy place, requisite for worship. But George Fox told them afterwards that the ground whereon he stood was as good as that of the steeple-house; besides, we find that Christ Himself did preach on a mountain, and also at the seaside. In the afternoon, he spoke about three hours, directing all to the Spirit of God in themselves."—*Sewel's History*, vol. i. pp. 88, 89.

can hardly be censured for supposing that if the Sacraments and public worship were merely forms, they could not be essentials of the Gospel. Is it less unlikely that the command to observe the Eucharist should be metaphorical, than the ordinance itself? Doubtless this earnest man did not discern that his teaching would turn men away from Christ, or interfere with the "one Mediator between God and men." Yet that such was the real tendency of his system is apparent even from the report of his friendly historian, whose object is to show that he maintained the common truths, which are received among Christians. The basis of his instruction is stated to have been, "that every man is enlightened with the Divine light."[1] And in corroboration of this assertion (though their real proof could be only their own inward consciousness), he and his followers perpetually referred to the declaration, "that was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."[2] This passage, which refers in reality to the Incarnation of Christ, and consequently to the gifts bestowed upon His brethren through participation in Him as Mediator, they interpreted of an immediate indwelling of Godhead in the whole body of mankind. But the true light, which at the creation of man's race had bestowed on Adam the perfect light of His own image, the faint remains of which make up that light of nature which has shone since in every man's bosom, had, in the fulness of time, come Personally into the world, the Son of God. To confound this

[1] Sewel's *History*, ii. 575.

[2] St. Augustin shows that such an interpretation of St. John i. 9 (as maintained by the Pelagians), interferes with the reality of Christ's Mediation. The Greek, he observes, might be rendered: "That was the true light, which lighteth every man by coming into the world."—*De Pecc. Mer.*, i. 25. The translation of Tholuck and Olshausen is equivalent in effect, but less exact perhaps; "the true light, which lighteth every man, was coming into the world."

The erroneous interpretation of Fox was approved by Blanco White, when a Socinian. "Christianity must carry its own proof in its reasonableness, in its agreement with the *light within us*, as the original Quakers very properly asserted. . . . . This light of the conscience is what Christ and the original Apostles called the *Spirit*, which was to lead the Disciples into all *the truth*."—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 230.

peculiar gift, which was bestowed on humanity through the Incarnation of Christ, with that general influence of the Divine Spirit which all men inherit from their creation, is virtually a form of Rationalism. For it is to merge the gifts of grace in the gifts of nature. But suppose that to escape this danger the name of the Holy Ghost is introduced ; that *His* present influence is represented as the fulfilment of God's general promises to humanity. Yet even then, unless the manhood of the one Mediator is regarded as the fountain and well-head of those gifts, which the Comforter distributes to Christ's members, Rationalism is only disguised under the kindred heresy of Sabellianism. For in this case the work of the Holy Ghost is represented as something which supersedes the work of Christ, as though the same Being, who once dwelt in Christ's manhood, dwells *instead thereof* in the manhood of individual Christians. The Doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation is, that through the communication of His human nature, its quickening gifts are bestowed according to their measure upon His members below : to suppose these gifts therefore to be obtained by God's immediate indwelling, without such communication, is to pass Him by in our approach to God. This is the exact result of the Sabellian heresy, which usually represents the Almighty as having had three successive modes of dwelling upon earth : first, in His ancient worship, then in the humanity of Christ, and, that mode of dwelling being terminated, in the minds of men. These are supposed by the Sabellians to be three successive economies ; three several temples, as it were, in which the same Person has been pleased to display Himself. Thus is the real action of the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity explained away, and the mystery of the Godhead evaporates in three successive relations of the same Being towards mankind. On this principle the Sacraments, as Fox asserted, may well be dispensed with, "because Christ the substance" is "come :" [1] the purpose, that is, of His Incarnation, is supposed to be completed, and the dispensation of the

[1] Sewel's *History*, ii. p. 580.

Spirit is alleged to leave nothing for His man's nature to perform. Neither need we wonder at what otherwise would seem the strange delusion, that James Naylor should declare himself to be actually Christ, and that many of his brethren should so regard him. There seems little reason for doubting that the opinions, a few years later attributed to them by Leslie, were not uncommon among the early Quakers. "The Quakers," he asserts, "say Christ took flesh, but no otherwise, as they explain it, than as angels assumed bodies, or as He (Christ or the Word) did inspire or dwell in Prophets or holy men of old; though they allow (not always) that Christ did inspire the person of that man Jesus in a higher measure than other men. But they deny any proper Incarnation of Christ, that is, that He was made flesh, or that He and Jesus were one Person. Yet they allow Jesus to be called Christ, from the dwelling of Christ in Him; but for the same reason they take the name of Christ to themselves, and say that it belongs to them as well as to Jesus."[1] These statements show that the Quakers had already adopted the Sabellian[2] hypothesis respecting Our Lord's nature; and the prevalence of avowed Socinianism among them in later days is a still more manifest indication of the result which attends the abandonment of the Sacramental system.[3]

The example of the Quakers shows by what inevitable sequence the neglect of Our Lord's office as Mediator leads to heresies respecting His nature. Two writers of the present age, each the head of a theological school, may be cited as an evidence that inadequate views respecting His nature have a corresponding connection with a low estimate of the gifts of grace. The sentiments of Professor Schleiermacher are apparent from a state-

[1] *The Snake in the Grass*, sec. x. Leslie's Works, vol. ii. p. 67.

[2] Mr. Clarkson attributes direct Sabellianism to the Quakers. After stating what are the offices of the Holy Ghost, he says, as the result of their hypothesis: "Christ, as He held the offices contained in the proposition, was the Spirit of God."—*History of Quakerism*, ii. 224.

[3] That Socinian opinions predominated among the Quakers was commonly affirmed by the late Mr. Gurney, himself a member of their body, though an able and zealous opponent of that form of error.

ment, for which its antithetical form probably has gained the wider acceptance, that "Catholicism is that system which represents the relation of the individual to Christ to be dependent on his relation to the Church; Protestantism, that which represents the relation of the individual to the Church to be dependent on his relation to Christ."[1] This contrast is put forward by Schleiermacher as containing the characteristic distinction between the two leading parties who call themselves Christians. But the very statement of such a contrast involves a virtual denial of the spiritual nature of the Church. For if the Church be really Christ's "body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," then its spiritual or invisible action is inseparable from the right use of its visible ordinances, and it becomes impossible to contrast things, which are actually identical. It would be an analogous question, as was observed, to ask whether we were men by being joined to Adam, or were joined to Adam by being men. It is Christ's manhood which binds men through sacraments to His mystic body. So that to give effect to this contrast, the Church must be supposed to be only a human system, devised for the more convenient working of religion among men, and not the presence of Christ's manhood, acting spiritually on all who are engrafted into Himself. How is it then that a writer who enters so deeply into some parts of the Christian system, and is regarded as their chief authority by a large portion of what are considered the more orthodox Germans, should have adopted a principle which implies a complete denial of the spiritual life of the Church? The answer may be learned from the account of Schleiermacher's opinions given by his countryman Dorner. Schleiermacher, he says, finds fault with the expression, that the Son of God has taken man's nature into the unity of His Person. For this would be to make the Personality of Christ dependent on the Personality of the Second Person in the Divine Godhead, and consequently on the Doctrine of the Trinity. Such a

[1] *Der Christliche Glaube*, i. 24, p. 132.

notion accordingly would be inconsistent with the Sabellian theory.[1]

Here, then, we see clearly to what we must attribute Schleiermacher's low estimate of the spiritual nature of the Church. He could not suppose it to be the mystical body of the Eternal Son, united by spiritual presence to His glorified humanity, because there was wanting in his system that substratum for such a doctrine which the truth of the Trinity could alone supply (p. 113). If the same tendency is to be found in the teaching of Archbishop Whately, his probity and public spirit, as well as his high station, are a sufficient guarantee that it is not from any intentional rejection of the authorized declarations of the Church. Neither does the writer pretend to conjecture how far the Archbishop may be conscious of the tendency of that system, the results of which are visible in his works. But though it would be unfair to charge individuals with holding the logical consequence of their assertions, there can be no injustice in showing how one peculiarity in a school or writer involves another as its natural complement. This may be seen in the case of Archbishop Whately, whose views of the Church are in exact accordance with what might be anticipated from his opinions respecting the Blessed Trinity,[2] and respecting Christ

[1] "The Christians' inward consciousness" (for this, and not the presence of the Holy Ghost with the body of the Church, is Schleiermacher's criterion, whether for proving the truth of Scripture, or for explaining it) —"this inward consciousness," he says, "does not compel us to think of the acting of the Redeemer in any other way, than as His Spirit more and more, by organizing and influencing humanity, diffuses in an ever-increasing sphere its action and its life. Christ, as a historical person, has, according to his view, no other significance, than as His example is the means of propagating that spirit which He has infused into the community." "In this manner, then, the personal existence in which Christ appeared, loses all its importance so soon as it has transplanted itself into others."—*Dorner's Person Christi*, first ed. pp. 503, 523.

[2] God, says the Archbishop, is "revealed to us in three characters (which was anciently the ordinary sense in our language of the word 'person'), as standing in three relations to us."—*Sermons on various Subjects*, 1835, p. 203.

"The Latin word 'persona' signified originally a *mask*, which actors wore on the stage; the word came to signify the character itself, which the

Our Lord. For the word Person, as used in respect to the Blessed Trinity, means merely, according to the Archbishop, some new relation or character assumed by the same Being. He says, accordingly, that "in respect of the sacrifice of Christ, and of the spiritual gifts poured out on the Disciples, it was the same thing in *relation* to *them* as if there had been really three distinct Beings."[1] And again, "Our Lord took care to indicate that the Comforter the Disciples are to expect is no other than Himself under another character."[2]

It is not here inquired how far these assertions accord with the statements of Scripture, or the teaching of the Church of England.[3] But they account clearly enough for the view which is adopted by Archbishop Whately respecting the Church of Christ. His respect for the declarations of Scripture leads him

actor played; and afterwards any character, real or assumed, which any one sustained: as, *e.g.*, in a passage of Cicero, where he is describing the process by which he composed his pleadings, by imagining himself in the place of his opponent, and of the judge, as well as his own: 'Tres personas unus suscipio—meam, adversarii, judicis.' We should render this by saying, 'I assume these three characters,' or 'I place myself in these three situations.'" "Persona, in its classical sense, was naturally adopted by Theologians to distinguish the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the Blessed Trinity, so as to imply the unity of the Divine Being, who is all and each of these; and the word Person was adopted by our Divines in the same sense. In this sense its difference from Person as commonly employed is most important."—*Whately's Logic*, first ed. 1826, p. 292.

In later editions this note is considerably lengthened, so that its statements appear in a less concentrated and naked form. But nothing indicates that Archbishop Whately designs to recall his previous assertions, which indeed he has virtually repeated in subsequent sermons.

[1] Sermons, 1835, p. 202. [2] Ditto, p. 197.

[3] The sentiments of Sabellius are recorded by Theodoret, *Dial.* ii., on Heretical Fables (cited in Ratcliffe's *Creed of St. Athanasius Illustrated*, p. 85): "Sabellius the African, of Pentapolis, introduced this heresy. He said that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost were one Person, and one Person bearing three names; and he calls on the same, sometimes as the Father, sometimes as the Son, and sometimes as the Holy Spirit: and that in the Old Testament He gave laws as the Father; but in the New He was incarnated as the Son; and that as the Holy Spirit He sat upon the Apostles."

The Sabellian tenets are not only denied in the Athanasian Creed, but are censured by name in the first Canon of the Council of Constantinople, one of the four General Councils, whose decrees by our present law (1 Eliz. c. i. s. 36) afford a criterion of heresy.

to assert strongly its claim to authority: what is wanting in his system is a due estimate of its ordinances as means of grace. Now, if God's Presence as Mediator has been succeeded by His Presence as the Holy Ghost, the Church can no longer be characterized by its relation to Christ, as His mystic body united by the spiritual action of His man's nature to Himself. So that those who do not, as did the Quakers, deny its existence, are thrown upon the fact that it is a social system for the advance of religion, established under God's sanction, and conducive in various ways to those purposes of improvement for which God bestows His help on individuals among men. Thus is the present action of the one common Mediator lost sight of, and the Church, instead of being a means of grace, becomes simply a scheme of government. The consequence, when men are led, like Archbishop Whately, by the plain words of Scripture to take a high view of Church authority,[1] is to infuse harshness and technicality into the Gospel system. The Kingdom of Christ seems as though it was designed to limit the gifts of His grace rather than to extend them. The Church assumes the austerity of a Sabine mother rather than the affectionate loving-kindness of the daughter of Zion. Since its ordinances are not coincident with the means of grace, but something besides and beyond them, the question naturally arises, "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" So that men's natural instinct testifies against the maintenance of authority, while the precepts of Scripture forbid its abolition.

Such are some of the evils of forgetting the real nature of the Church's being—our union, namely, with the manhood of Christ in His mystic body, together with His true Presence and continued Mediation. These doctrines, it may be observed in conclusion, are also our right security against substituting the Church as a formal system in place of its Head; and they afford the best answers to the intricate questions respecting Church

[1] Vide the passages quoted from Whately's *Kingdom of Christ* in the next chapter.

communion and Church obedience. So long as the Church is regarded as an external system, based on certain laws, and administered by certain leaders, it can never fail to enlist a measure of that party spirit which belongs to man's nature, and thus to draw away attention from the holy purposes for which it was instituted. The only safeguard against this danger is the due subordination of its external framework to its internal principle; and the constant recognition that its life depends, not on the gifts of government but on the gifts of grace. If the essence of the Church's existence be that certain men have a right to rule, and teach and minister, whether they be chosen by the free voice of the congregation, imposed by government, or delegated by the Apostles, there is such large opening for cabal and dispute, that love and peace and Christ's presence will soon be lost in the din of party strife. The Presbyterian platform offers as good footing to the spirit of partisanship as the system of Episcopacy; and the Pilgrim Fathers of Massachusetts were as ready to persecute as Boniface or Hildebrand. But let the essence of the Church's existence be felt to be Christ's presence —let it be remembered that His manhood is the true seed of the renewed race, and that through spiritual presence it bestows its life-giving power on all the members of His mystic body—let every other question be dependent upon these—let them take their place, as of subordinate importance, and as merely contributing to this great result—and what room is there for discord between Christ and the Church, when the Church is Christ Himself manifest in His mystic body? "For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church." The theorist may be unvisited by the sun's warmth while he discusses its nature, or the poet while he describes its brilliancy; but how can we lose sight of his glorious beams by going forth to walk in the sunshine? And so long as this Divine principle is kept fully in view, it can hardly fail to soften and elevate those whom it influences. So that if the harshness of party spirit be not cured, it may at least be abated.

There are those indeed who forget that by Christ is meant that "one Mediator between God and men," who unites these two natures, and is to be approached therefore through that manhood whereby He allies Himself to our race. Their wish is for such communing with the Spirit of the Universe as may be maintained by each individual spirit in the separate temple of the heart. To set forth Christ the Mediator as our only road of access to the Most High is supposed by them to encumber our approach. This is to renounce Christianity for Rationalism, and to prefer the system of nature to the system of grace. For if the doctrine of Mediation be accepted at all, the results which it involves must be accepted also. And, therefore, to maintain that the outward means of grace, whereby we are united to the manhood of Christ, are not less necessary than those emotions of our own, which have their seat within, is not to put the Church in stead of Christ, but to protest against men's putting themselves in the place of their Redeemer. To speak of inward seriousness as necessary, is only to testify the truth of each man's separate responsibility; but to speak of it as superseding outward means, is to do away with the office of the "one Mediator." The individual life of each man's spirit, as opposed to the carelessness of a thoughtless walk, is the very treading down of Satan under our feet; but to contrast it with the value of Gospel ordinances is to deny Christ—to depose Him from His office of a Mediator—and to set up idols of intercession in our own hearts.

Again, the recollection that Christ's Spiritual Presence is the Church's life, is the answer to all questions respecting Church Communion. For the Church's being depends on union with Him; its well-being on union with all His members. The latter is as essential to its perfect state as that holiness of life which Christ likewise entreated for all His members; the Church's completeness, therefore, cannot be attained without both the one and the other. But as we see holiness of life to be too often wanting in its present season of warfare, so also is

the perfect unity of the whole Christian body. That which cannot be dispensed with—the loss of which would be its death—is that union with Christ on which depends its claim to be the Lord's Body. While this continues, the several members of Christ are in truth united to one another, whether they discern it or no; because they are united to the common Head of the Body. So that "if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and if one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it." And the same principle must be our guide respecting all questions of Church-obedience. For Church-obedience depends on the authority to bless, not on the power to govern. Its rule is not coercive, but parental; it stands on the communication of gifts, not the enactment of penalties. This is what makes persecution alien to its nature; so that such harshness is abhorred by men's instinct, even if their reason does not condemn it. Thus in the world of grace, as in that of nature, is affection the root of duty; and men's relation to the Church of their Baptism is built on that fundamental law which is the basis of social life. Our Catechism, therefore, rests religious as well as temporal authority on the Fifth Commandment, and deduces from it the obligation to obey spiritual as well as temporal masters. For "Jerusalem which is above is the mother of us all." Hence the rule of Church-obedience is limited only by that original duty of obedience to God, which cannot be superseded by any subsequent obligation. Such considerations suggest at once what are men's relations to Christ's body in that state or place where God's Providence has fixed them, and also what they owe to the more extended system, in which it is their blessing to have an individual share. Towards their own mother Church they owe not only obedience in things lawful, but also reverence and thankfulness. So long as she continues to bless, they may not cease to obey. There are those who speak of themselves as the Church's friends, forgetting that a term, which might be appropriate if employed by the holy Angels, is the extreme of irreverence, when employed by sinful men respecting

the Mystical Body of Christ their Saviour. For it implies ignorance of their filial relation to the Church of Christ. Hence the common opinion that men are at liberty to join any religious community where statements are propounded, and where practices are pursued, which harmonize with their feelings. And hence men's attachment to their own part of the Church's body is measured less by their obedience to its rules than by their professed aversion to other systems.

All these errors result from a forgetfulness of the central truth, that the Church of Christ is His body; His presence its life; its blessing the gift of spiritual union with His man's nature. Where this is given, there is opened for men the gift of life and state of salvation. Our duty towards that portion of it in which our lot is cast arises from love to itself, not from hatred to others; the lines of our heritage are marked out by affection and not by antipathy. For in it lies our actual participation in the Mediation of Christ. Through Him only who is both God and man is there access to the Father. For such has been the appointment of His sovereign wisdom, "that so in the person of a Mediator the true ladder might be fixed, whereby God might descend to His creatures, and His creatures might ascend to God."[1]

CHAPTER XII.

OF COMMON WORSHIP AS A MEANS OF UNION WITH THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST.

THE actings of Christ our Lord since His Ascension have been stated to be: first, His Intercession on man's behalf with God the Father, and secondly, His Spiritual Presence through His man's nature with His brethren. And this Spiritual Presence

[1] Bacon's *Confession of Faith*, u. s.

of the man Christ Jesus has been shown to be vouchsafed in His Church, whereby "we are members of His body; of His flesh, and of His bones." For men are joined to His body natural which was slain, in His body mystical which is sanctified. The question which next arises respects the means of union with that mystical body in which men have title to the privileges of the Gospel. Of these the first and most comprehensive is common worship. This point must now be established. The considerations which lead to it are:

First—The nature of common worship.

Secondly—The grounds of its necessity.

Thirdly—The place which it occupied in the Jewish system.

Fourthly—Its connexion with the Doctrine of Mediation. And hence follows,

Fifthly—The necessity of an ordained Ministry and public Ritual.

I. The very nature of common worship shows its efficacy in maintaining our connexion with the mystical body of Christ. For what is it but the voice and action of the Christian Community, which, if it has life, must by such symptoms show that it lives? Every organized body has some mode of giving expression to that pervading principle, which renders it a whole. A tree puts forth leaves; animal life discovers itself by sound and motion. This is that simple method of rendering homage to God which the Psalmist ascribes to the whole visible creation. And if the Church be not a mere aggregation of men, who meet by accident within the same precincts, but the living exponent of a spiritual power, which renders it Christ's mystical body, then that quickening energy, with which it is instinct, must have some means of utterance. And since its office is not only towards men—whom it gathers for their own benefit into its fostering bosom—but likewise towards Him, whose "praise is in the great congregation;" therefore its first object must be that the inhabitants of this lower world, "with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven" should "laud and

magnify His glorious name, saying Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory." Now, if this be the Church's chosen function, to partake in it must be our first means of exercising our Christian privilege, and of claiming our portion in that Mystical Body of Christ wherein we are members.

II. How deeply this feeling was implanted from the first in the Christian Community, appears from the grounds on which the importance of public worship has always rested. Its indispensable necessity must have arisen from the nature of the case, inasmuch as it did not arise from positive enactment. No positive command to meet for united worship occurs in the New Testament, except that incidental one in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which cannot have been relied upon in the Western Church, by which in early times the Epistle to the Hebrews was not received; and yet the first Christians not only encountered every danger, but, what was a still stronger proof of their conviction, they violated those civil laws to which they usually paid such prompt obedience, rather than forego the privilege of that common worship whereby each man maintained his part in the fellowship of his Saviour. How could they be justified in disobeying Cæsar, unless their duty to God had been peremptory and unquestioned? But it stood on no direct command of Scripture. It must have rested, therefore, on the very nature of the case—on the connexion of this service with those general duties and privileges which are set forth as the first principle of the Christian life—on the necessity of union with Christ as the new Head of the redeemed race—on the common obligation to honour God more than man—it must have been the very act by which men professed themselves Christ's servants, and claimed membership in the mystical body of the Crucified. The very publicity and danger of the deed makes the weight which was attached to it the more manifest. Instruction could be given by books or by single conference. The consecrated elements might be carried round singly to those who desired to partake them.

But when the Roman Law[1] had expressly forbidden the meeting of religious bodies, the common worship of the Christians became, as Pliny expresses it, the very "sum of their crime."[2] It was forbidden therefore during the Diocletian persecution, even under the mild rule of Constantius;[3] and its permission is the main point expressed in the tolerating edict issued by Galerius[4] just before his death. Yet in the face of all this opposition, the Christian Church never intermitted its united worship; the duties which it could not perform in public and during the day, were discharged secretly and during the hours of darkness; it retreated into the heart of the earth, and maintained itself in catacombs and the abodes of the dead, that it might issue forth when its season was come, and publish in the face of the sun those benedictions in which it calls on heaven and earth to partake.

III. The importance of common worship as our means of union with the body of Christ is further manifested, if we consider wherein lay the peculiar privileges which were enjoyed by the Jews. Their peculiar blessing was plainly that covenanted access to God which was allowed to them alone of ancient nations. "What nation is there," said Moses, "who hath God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for?" The wide distance which separates man from his Maker was not bridged over indeed so effectually as since God has become man and man God, but a foundation was laid for this wonderful bond of union. For the first time in God's dealings with mankind was there a nation chosen to receive the privilege of accepted prayer. Private prayer there had been, doubtless, from the first; the instinct which leads men to pray in time of distress seems a sufficient sanction for it. And family prayer had probably commenced in the household of Seth, when "men began to call on the name of the Lord;" and had since continued

[1] The proofs are collected by Gieseler, i. 12, notes C & D, vol. i. pp. 31, 32. Trajan renewed the law against ἑταιρεῖαι, A.D. 99.

[2] *Epis.* lib. x. 97.

[3] Lactantius, *De morte Persecutorum*, c. 15.

[4] Ibid. c. 34.

in the tents of the Patriarchs. But this usage had rested on natural instinct or individual communication; it was personal or family; it was not relevant to any peculiar promise, or any public institutions; it belonged to that Patriarchal state in which the Most High was pleased to favour His dutiful followers by single and especial manifestations. Under this rule did Enoch, Job, and Abraham, walk with God. But this rule waxed insufficient when, with the increasing extension of mankind, those lights which they possessed in early times were withdrawn. Hence the censure passed by Our Lord upon the Samaritans, who thought their practice justified because their "fathers worshipped upon this mountain:" "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews." It was not in the doctrines of a pure Monotheism that the Samaritans of that age were wanting. Their habit was to address themselves to the Father of all, through the unaided service of their own devotion. But they worshipped they knew not what, because they had no certainty of acceptance. "Salvation is of the Jews." To them only belongs the assurance that the Father of all will hear them. This means of access no other nation possessed. They had the "lively oracles" which afforded an intercourse with the Almighty.

Now, on what was this intercourse dependent? It could not rest only on a conviction of the existence of Jehovah; in this respect they were not superior to their Fathers, the Patriarchs, even if they surpassed their contemporaries. That which marked them out as God's people was the national Ritual, by which they were assured of access to Him. The road indeed was narrow, painful, and circuitous; and yet it was a road of approach to God. All right of drawing near Him was through their nation. Their family union conferred on each individual in their tribes a pre-eminence which was enjoyed by no other people. "All the earth is Mine," declared Jehovah, but "ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of Priests, and an holy nation." Royalty lies in high descent, and Priesthood in that peculiar consecration which marks men

out to draw near to the presence of God ; and both these qualities centred in that whole society, all whose members were so much more favoured than the residue of mankind. The consciousness of this pre-eminence was felt when the High Priest was observed to bear on him the symbols of the whole world, when he entered into the holy place, because he was the representative of the whole creation.[1] If this were so, he was the type of Him who stretched out His sacrificing arms upon the Cross, that He might in truth embrace the Universe. In this wise were the Jews favoured above the rest of men. And this privilege they enjoyed through their participation in those public acts which were the especial privilege and work of their nation. It was not that each individual Jew found his way to God through his individual excellency ; but he had a claim to participate in that public service by which His nation was brought nigh to the Almighty. The national Ritual was a bond of union which gave the individual a vantage-ground in his approach to God. That general communing of his spirit with the Great Author of the universe, which was all that the Heathen man enjoyed, was sanctioned and exalted by the mediatorial character of the public Ritual, in which the Jewish nation had a common interest. The priesthood of Aaron did not derogate from the general privilege, which made Israel at large a royal Priesthood ; it was the very basis on which their blessing rested—it was the provisional appointment of that mediatorial office, by which God and man were bound together ; the typical representation of that true High Priest, who is the perfect Mediator between earth and heaven. Therefore to reject the Jewish Ritual during that period, when it was the appointed means of foreshowing Him who was to come, would have been in reality to reject Christ, and to slight the efficacy of His Mediation. So that when Korah maintained that the separate priesthood of every individual Israelite dispensed with the necessity of that national Ritual, which anticipated the Mediation of Christ, it pleased God by immediate judgments to show who

[1] Philo, quoted in Dorner's *Person. Christi*, vol. i. p. 48.

should "come near to offer incense before the Lord." Thus was it plainly seen what was that channel of Mediation through which individual prayers should ascend to heaven. And as such the holiest and most spiritual Israelites used it. Their ardent aspirations to God were grounded always on that peculiar privilege of approach, which had its central and consecrating point in their national Ritual. Such as voluntarily neglected those means of confederation, whereby men maintained their portion in the public service, were cut off from God's people. But those who by involuntary hindrances were precluded from actual association with their brethren, were not left to that mere feeling after an unknown helper, which was all that the Heathen possessed; their thoughts travelled to their native land, they associated themselves in spirit to that national worship which God had made the channel of heavenly gifts, and thus they claimed their part in the collective privilege of the nation. Thus did David in spirit go "with the multitude" from the "land of Jordan and the hill Mizar." Thus did Daniel pray, "his windows being open in his chamber towards Jerusalem." This was the very principle of the Jewish service, which extended to those who were in distant lands, as well as to those who, being gathered in the Temple's courts, "were praying without at the time of incense." "They knew much better than the Heathen that God's throne of Majesty was in heaven, and yet were to tender their devotions unto Him as extraordinarily present in His temple or sanctuary."[1] For the principle of a public Ritual does not depend on the actual presence of men, which may be interrupted by the accidents of our weakness, but on that actual presence of God, which He vouchsafes through His appointed means of intervention. The voluntary neglect of such opportunities on our part would be to despise the privilege of intercourse with God. It would be to prefer our own means of access to those which the appointed Mediator bestows. If we have a true belief that the privilege of union with God is bestowed through those especial channels of intercourse which

[1] Jackson's Works, xi. 3, 11.

He has Himself ordained, we shall make such efforts as were made by the early Christians to use them. For the whole value of such a service depends on the reality of those blessings which God bestows, as He unquestionably bestowed them in former times, on those who worshipped towards His mercy-seat, and as since the Incarnation of Christ they have been pledged in fuller measure to those who make up together the mystical body of the Lord.

IV. Now, this leads us to discern why such especial importance should be attached to common worship in the Church of God. For since Christ Incarnate is the real priest, through whom all Jewish service was effectual—His body the real victim, His members the true temple—therefore to suppose that individual piety dispenses with the necessity of participation in the Church's collective acts, is the same thing as if a Jew had maintained that it superseded the necessity of participation in the ancient Ritual. Communion with the Church in its united acts of worship brings men into the same relation to Christ, the one true and abiding Mediator, which was gained in their degree for the men of old time, by participation in that typical and imperfect service which was maintained through the continual offering of the Levitical sacrifices. As a Jew could not approach God save through the intervention of the expected Messiah, so cannot a Christian save through the mediation of the Messiah who has been manifested. The single prayers which were offered by the pious Jew in the solitary temple of his heart, ascended to God because, through the privilege of the nation, heaven and earth were bound together. And the solitary worship of the fervent Christian is not effectual through its private merit, but by virtue only of that intercession which is offered for the elect at large, and of that sacrifice, in which the whole Christian Body has common interest. To rest therefore on the mere separate intercourse of man with his Maker, on the private aspirations of the individual soul, would be to pass by the intervention of Christ as something unnecessary, and to set up our own spirit as the Mediator through whom the Father of all

could be approached. And this would be an idolatry which all Christian men would abhor. Yet is this virtually the effect when personal devotion, the importance of which cannot in itself be too much enforced, is represented as a rival to that participation in the public ordinances of His Church, whereby God is approached through Christ. True it is that all Christian men are Kings and Priests, and thus have immediate access to God. But then this access must be *in Christ*—it depends on their character as members of His body—it is because that Mediation is complete which in Jewish times was imperfect—because God and man have been made one in Christ. The Jews likewise were all a royal priesthood, but this did not neutralize the necessity of that public Ritual, whereby every individual had privilege of approach. Neither does the privilege of single Christians interfere with the necessity of that Mediation of Christ on which it is dependent. "Albeit the Temple of Jerusalem, wherein God's people only were to worship, were long since demolished; yet the sanctuary, wherein they were to worship God, is rather translated or advanced from earth to heaven than destroyed; for it was God's presence that made the temple, and that is more extraordinary in Christ's body, than ever it had been in Solomon's temple."[1]

But then the question recurs, why is this reference to Christ Our Lord especially connected with His public service? Why is it not satisfied by that mere regard which is paid to Him singly, by those who do not choose to associate themselves with their fellow-creatures? Cannot men's hearts travel forth towards Him as their God in privacy and seclusion? There have been many who have professed to worship Christ singly, through the mere exercise of their private faith; and this is the real principle of all those separatists, who, like the Quakers, have no Sacramental union, and by whom common worship has been exchanged for simple teaching. Now, the reason why such a system is a disparagement of Our Lord's Mediation, is because His Medi-

[1] Jackson's Works, u. s.

ation does not depend merely on our calling ourselves by His name, or on our entertaining certain feelings towards Him; but results from that actual relation, which He condescended to assume towards us, when He took our nature into abiding union with His own. His Mediation is a reality, external to ourselves, and not a mere matter of our own imagination. It is not enough to say that we gain certain blessings by resorting to that Divine Being, who happened once to be upon earth—as though He accidentally undertook the office of speaking in our favour; but His Mediation is the consequence of that permanent character, which He was pleased to adopt by assuming manhood. He thus became the Head of the renewed family, who offered Himself a sacrifice on behalf of the whole, and through whom all graces devolve upon the rest; and, therefore, by a certain singular fitness was He marked out to be the representative of His brethren. So that towards the completeness of His work, it was essential that those for whom He spoke should be as truly bound to His manhood, as by descent they were to their original parent. For this work was expressly declared to be undertaken on behalf of His mystical body. It is for those who believe on Him through His Apostles' words, and who are "one as we are one," that He intercedes with His Father. His advocacy results from His being "Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Would we have part, then, in His Intercession as Mediator, we must be members in that "family in heaven and earth," which is called after His name. This membership involves federal union with the collective Church: to be a member is to be a part of a body, because the existence of parts implies the existence of a whole. And, therefore, the notion of a mere individual relation to our Lord, independently of that social tie which binds us to Him as a part of His mystic body, would lead, when followed into its results, to the virtual denial of that office, which He discharges as man; Christ would be viewed, according to the Sabellian theory, as a mere name or

relation, under which in this present Dispensation the Father of all has pleased to reveal Himself; and His actual intervention as a Person, other than the Father and the Holy Ghost, and as co-operating through that nature which He took of the Virgin, in the great work of bringing many sons unto salvation, would be practically forgotten.

The permanency, therefore, of Christ's Mediation, together with the importance of His present interference, is the true point which is asserted when the necessity of the Church's office is maintained. But if a present work is transacted on our behalf in the Gospel Kingdom, through the merit of Christ's ascended manhood, some means must be appointed, through which His brethren may partake its benefits. A system of worship upon earth is the necessary correlative to a work of intercession in heaven. The one implies the other. And, therefore, in that early age of the Church, when Our Lord's Mediation was felt to be the life of the Christian community, there was a universal and unqualified assertion, that as certainly as Christ's sacrifice was pleaded effectually above, it was likewise truly participated in Gospel ordinances, and that those things which were done on earth in the Church's united acts, made part of that grand sacrifice which has its consummation in heaven. So that while all other parts of the Christian Ritual were spoken of as sacrificial in their character, that service by which men especially participated in the Mediation of Christ, because they are most truly bound by it to His mystic body, *i.e.*, the Eucharist or Lord's Supper, was called emphatically the Christian sacrifice. And this is an act which, by its federal character, involves the necessity of that united worship, whereby men partake in the collective privileges of the Church of God. "Irenæus[1] tells me," says our own Mede,[2] "there were offerings there, *i.e.*, in the Old Testament; there are also offerings here, *i.e.*, in the New Testament; there

[1] S. Irenæus, iv. 18, 2.

[2] "That the Christian Service is an Oblation proved by the Fathers." *Mede's Works*, b. ii. c. iv. p. 361.

were sacrifices among the people, *i.e.*, the Jews; there are sacrifices also in the Church." And after mentioning that the Holy Communion was commonly called a sacrifice; "it would be infinite," he adds, "to note all the places and authors where and by whom it is thus called." He contents himself therefore with citing those authors by whom it was so described in the lifetime of the Apostles. In justification of this mode of speaking, St. Irenæus adduces that prophetic description which had been given by Malachi of the services of the Christian Church: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering." Now, the one of these things, incense, is explained by St. John to typify the prayers of Saints;[1] the pure offering, therefore, must on its part have something to indicate. Accordingly, it was understood to be the "new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles offers throughout the whole world to God."[2] An oblation which is thus explained by Mede: "We are wont to conclude our prayers with, *Through Jesus Christ Our Lord*. And this is the specification whereby the worship of a Christian is distinguished from that of the Jew. Now, that which we in all our prayers and thanksgivings do *vocally*, when we say *through Jesus Christ Our Lord*, the Ancient Church in her public and solemn service did *visibly*, by representing Him, according as He commanded, in the symbols of His body and blood. What time, then, so fit and seasonable to commend our devotions unto God, as when the Lamb of God lies slain upon the holy table; and we receive visibly, though mystically, those gracious pledges of His blessed body and blood? This was that sacrifice of the ancient Church the Fathers so much ring in our ears—the sacrifice of Praise and Prayer through Jesus Christ, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine."[3]

[1] Rev. v. 8. St. Augustin calls the Lord's Prayer "quotidianum spiritale quodam modo incensum."—*De Nat. et Grat.* 35.

[2] S. Iren. iv. 17, 5.

[3] Mede, ubi sup. ii. 2, p. 357.

These assertions respecting the Holy Communion involve the two following conditions: First, that this ordinance should be allowed to be as truly a sacrifice as any of those ancient rites to which that term was commonly applied either in Scripture or by men; secondly, that its efficacy should be rested wholly upon that sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross once for all, which forms the basis of His Mediation. The first of these conditions is implied in the language of the early Church respecting the Blessed Eucharist: it follows from the fact that "we have an altar,"[1] and that "this" is "our sacrifice."[2] The second results from the reality of that system of Mediation, whereby man is reconciled to God. The principle of this Mediation was, that He who undertook it partook truly of both natures, so that He was at once God's representative among men, and man's advocate with the Creator. And in this character, what valuable thing could He offer to God but the sacrifice of Himself? His sanctified humanity was the only pure thing which could be gathered out of the mass of corrupted mortality. And, therefore, no earthly accessions could increase its amount or enhance its value. If its value were not infinite, it would not suffice to atone for all sins; if its amount were not unbounded, it would not take in all offenders. To this sacrifice, therefore, no acts of ours can contribute anything; our hundred pence, if we could offer them, would add nothing to the value of His ten thousand talents. So that the only ground on which the Holy Communion can have that character of a sacrifice, which has been assigned to it, must be through its participation in the central work of Mediation, the offering, *i.e.*, of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

But how can the Eucharist or Christian sacrifice be an "offering of the body of Jesus Christ;" since "Christ dieth no more," but "hath entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us?" So that the body of Jesus Christ which He took of the Virgin, that through its sanctification[3] He might sanctify the mass of humanity, has its material place in heaven, "until

[1] Hebrews xiii. 10. [2] Communion Service. [3] St. John xvii. 19.

the restitution of all things." This body, therefore, cannot die again, nor can its material place be other than at God's right hand; yet must this be the very body which we present to the Father; for were it aught besides, our dependence would not be on that anointed first-fruit[1] of man's nature which, that it might be the instrument of Mediation, was made personally one with God. The offering must be made, then, in a manner not incompatible with the truth that the thing offered "ever liveth:" and again, that according to its material place, it "is ever at the right hand of God." Now, this is the exact manner in which the sacrifice of Christ is declared to be presented before God: as in reference to time past He was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," so there "stood a Lamb, as it had been slain" before the throne, in the vision of the utmost future. So that our offerings derive their value from the same source which gave their efficacy to the ancient sacrifices. Theirs were not less truly sacrifices than ours, but with this difference, that the thing offered among them was the type, whereas the thing offered in our services is the reality. For thus is Christ consecrated "a Priest for ever," and His offering is "a perpetual sacrifice."[2] "The substance or matter of the sacrifice" of Christ, says Dr. Jackson, "is of the same force at this day to remit sins, that it was of whilst it was offered; for His human nature was consecrated by death and by His bloody passion, to be a sacrifice of everlasting virtue, to be the continual propitiation for our sins."[3]

Now, it is because what is pleaded above as the ground of our acceptance is that true manhood which was taken for the purpose of Mediation by the Son of God, that the Eucharist, rather than any other part of the Church's Ritual, is declared to be the Christian sacrifice. For "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." Through its

[1] "Totam nostram massam . . . . . assumpsit, factus primitiæ nostræ naturæ."—*Anas. Sin. Or.* 3, *Bib. Max. Pat.* ix. 932. Vide S. Athan. *De Inc. et c. Ar.* 12, vol. i. 879.

[2] Hebrews x. 12.

[3] Works, x. 55, 6.

character of a Sacrament, as shown in the next Chapter, does the Holy Communion connect us with that slain Humanity of the Incarnate Word, which is present by spiritual power in holy ordinances. Through this bread and this cup, that which is offered as a true sacrifice in heaven, is present as a real though immaterial agent in the Church's ministrations. So that what is done by Christ's ministers below, is a constituent part of that general work which the one great High Priest performs in heaven : through the intervention of his heavenly Head, the earthly sacrificer truly exhibits to the Father that body of Christ, which is the one only sacrifice for sins ; each visible act has its efficacy through those invisible acts of which it is the earthly expression ; and things done on earth are one with those done in heaven.

But though the body of Jesus Christ, present materially in heaven, and bestowed in holy ordinances through spiritual presence, supplies the Christian sacrifice with its whole intrinsic value, yet those things which are contributed by His brethren obtain acceptance by union with Him. To this circumstance the prayer and praise of Christians owe all their right to be admitted as a portion of the Christian sacrifice.[1] For the virtue of the Mediator's service extends itself to that of all His brethren. And so is it likewise with those elements of bread and wine, which are presented to God as a sample and first-fruits of His creation, that they may afterwards be set apart by consecration to be the means whereby that Mediator who has sanctified this whole defiled universe, may distribute Himself to men. These elements, therefore, like the prayers of men, cannot be an acceptable offering,

[1] The only way in which men can make part of a valuable sacrifice is, that they are regarded as parts of Him through whom only they are accepted. On this ground does St. Augustin speak of the Christian sacrifice as consisting of "multi unum corpus in Christo." But then it is because the Church is a part of that victim which is truly acceptable: "quod in ea re quam offert ipsa offeratur." And this offering is presented by our High Priest above, as a part of His continual Intercession: "Efficitur, ut tota ipsa redempta civitas, hoc est congregatio societasque sanctorum, universale sacrificium offeratur Deo per sacerdotem magnum, qui etiam se ipsum obtulit in passione pro nobis, ut tanti capitis corpus essemus."—*De Civitate Dei*, x. 6.

except so far as they have received *His* hallowing presence, who corrects the evils of the Fall. But when Malachi described the sacrifice of the Christian Church he looked plainly to some higher object than the mere material value of these preliminary offerings. For as incense typifies, but is not prayer, so the "pure offering" could not be the literal Mincha, or meat-offering, but that true sacrifice of which it was typical. And to what did all Jewish rites refer but to the one real Mediator? So that the oblation which Malachi contemplated, must have been that true Mincha, that hidden Manna, the body of Jesus Christ which was offered once for all. This it was which He declared should be presented in every place from the rising to the setting of the sun, by those priests and Levites whom the Gentile [1] Church should substitute for the ancient ministrants.

The account which has been given of the Eucharist will seem to some to make it too real a sacrifice, while to others it will seem wanting in reality. The latter will say that if the efficacious part of the Eucharistic offering is performed by our great Mediator in heaven—if the thing of value which is presented before God has already been brought into the heavenly temple—then that which remains to be done upon earth can only be a symbolical, and not a real offering. And they fear, therefore, that no great importance will be attached to that portion of the work, in which Christ's earthly servants are ministrants. But the statements which have been made are involved immediately by the central fact of the Doctrine of Mediation, that no perfect offering can be found among men except that manhood which was personally united to God. And that Christ's human body should have its material place in heaven, does not interfere with that presence which it has by spiritual power; or diminish therefore the sacredness of those elements or means whereby men participate it. For if to rest its efficacy on Christ's work above is incompatible with the opinion that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice, then must this name be denied to the Passover also. What was the real virtue of the

[1] Malachi i. 11; Isaiah lxvi. 21.

Passover, but that through its participation men had part in that acceptance which the Mediator effected? The lamb slain upon earth was not of intrinsic value, but that "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," in whose effectual atonement it gave Israel participation. To the heavenly temple, therefore, do those ancient writers direct our thoughts, who speak most strongly of the reality of the Christian sacrifice. "There is an altar in heaven," says St. Irenæus, "for to it our prayers and oblations are directed."[1] And therefore he speaks of "the Word"[2]—Christ, according to His man's nature—as the oblation which is offered to God. A similar statement is made by St. Ambrose: "On one side is the shadow, on another the representation, on a third the truth. The shadow is in the Law, the representation in the Gospel, the truth in heaven. In former times sacrifices consisted of lambs and calves: now Christ is offered, but He is offered according to His man's nature, according to that being in which He is receptive of suffering; and as Priest He offers up Himself as the ransom of our offences; He does it here in representation, He does it in truth there, where He mediates in the Father's presence as our Intercessor."[3]

The real point in dispute, therefore, supposing all verbal questions excluded, is whether that which is done in common worship, and especially in its crowning act, the Holy Communion, is done merely within man himself, in the region of his own feelings and intellect, or whether, besides this, it be something which belongs to the whole Church, which extends not only to earth, but to heaven, of which the agent is not only the man who supplicates on earth, but the Church's Head who supplicates in heaven. And this turns on the point whether man's salvation depends on a real work, external to ourselves, which our great Advocate is still carrying on by His Intercession, and through the pleading of His slain humanity.[4] So that we fall back

[1] S. Iren. iv. 18, 6. [2] S. Iren. iv. 18, 4.

[3] S. Ambros. *De Officiis Ministrorum*, i. 48, 248. S. Chrys. on Hebrews, cap. x. Hom. xvii. 3.

[4] "Besides the infinite value, we are to acknowledge," says Dr. Jackson,

upon the original matter of controversy, whether we are to accept the Church's Doctrine, that Our Lord's Incarnation is a truth, or the Sabellian opinion, that it is a fictitious representation. Let Christ be believed to be truly God and man, pleading for us the merits of that human nature, which He has consecrated through His Godhead, and there must be reality in those means whereby we are continually associated to that sanctified humanity, in union with which is all our hope. It is the certainty of this communion—the truth that on its media is our life dependent, because the thing with which we are thus connected is our life itself—which was so zealously contended for by those contemporaries of the Apostles, to whom Mede refers, when they asserted the reality of a sacrifice and therefore of a priesthood in the Church of Christ. For if there be such importance and reality in the work which is done by Christ, then the means whereby we participate it must be real and important. Through fear of a different error, many persons in later times, who never doubted the reality of this work, have used different language.[1] Their anxiety has been merely to exclude the notion, that human acts have any value, except through the sacrifice of Christ. But this truth is so far from being incom-

"the infinite or everlasting efficacy or operative virtue of this bloody sacrifice of the Son of God. Suppose the Son of God, immediately after He had paid the ransom for our sins, or in that instant in which He said *Consummatum est*, 'all is finished,' had deposed or laid aside the human nature in which He was conceived and born to the end and purpose that He might die in it (or according to it), His offering or sacrifice had been of value infinite, in that it could purchase so universal a pardon at God's hands for all sinners and for all sins. Yet if He had laid aside the human nature immediately after His suffering, the everlasting efficacy of this infinite sacrifice had been cut off."—*Works*, x. 55, 6.

[1] This is Waterland's explanation of the fact, that Hooker says "sacrifice is now no part of the Christian ministry," and that we have "properly now no sacrifice." "I presume he meant by *proper* sacrifice, *propitiatory*. In such a sense as that he might justly say, that sacrifice is no part of the Church ministry, or that the Christian Church has no sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such new language, be the meaning ever so right: the Fathers never used it."—*The Christian Sacrifice Explained*—*Waterland's Works*, viii. 169.

patible with the assertion of a priesthood and sacrifice by the primitive Fathers, that it is the very ground upon which they based its importance. They maintained the reality of those means whereby we are joined to Christ, for the purpose of showing that we cannot be saved, except through His "perpetual sacrifice." Now, since Christ's work is the work of the Great Head of renewed humanity for all His brethren, therefore the means whereby we hold to Him are an actual participation in His sacrifice. A sacrifice is not participated only by the sacrificing Priest, but by all those who through his intervention have a right in the action[1] which is performed, and a hope through the offering which is accepted. "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" Both laity, therefore, and priesthood[2] have a share in the Christian sacrifice—the one as participating in the virtue of the gift, the other as further contributing by their ministry to its common participation. Therefore, though it be a necessary result of our acceptance through the work of a Mediator, that the same party should be both Priest and Victim[3]—though looking at that meritorious act, on which man's acceptance is dependent, there is but one Priest and one sacrifice in Heaven and Earth—we yet may fitly apply the name both of Priests and sacrifices to those media, whereby that act which is continually pleaded in the Heavenly sanctuary is participated by surrounding multitudes. Neither can we speak too highly of the value of what is effected by Christ's earthly ministers, provided we render them subservient to that perfect sacrifice of Himself which can receive no augmentation.

[1] "Indubitatum est . . . . ipsos fideles præsentes una cum sacerdote offerre."—*Van Espen quoted by Maskell, Ancient Liturgy*, p. 69. Perrone's Lectures, vol. vi. p. 377.

[2] "As Christ, in virtue of His sacrifice on the Cross, intercedes for us with the Father—so does the minister of Christ's priesthood here; that the virtue of the eternal sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the Church, both for things temporal and eternal."—*Taylor's Worthy Communicant*, i. iv. 4.

[3] S. Aug. *De Trin.* iv. 14.

Why then is it that the existence of a Christian Priesthood and a Christian sacrifice has been questioned by those who never doubted the reality of Christ's Intercession and Atonement as an actual work external to ourselves? Two things have been principally alleged: first, that their assertion is inconsistent with the privilege of Christians; and secondly, that it is incompatible with the prerogative of Christ. These objections shall be considered in their order.

To be "Kings and Priests" has been declared in Scripture to be the privilege of individual Christians. For to them more signally than to Israel of old has been given that right of access to God which is at once a royal privilege and a priestly function. This is the meaning of that "sacerdotium laicorum" which was claimed in primitive times for all Christians. But on what does this title depend? It results solely from the fact that all members of the family of Christ are associated in their degree in those privileges, of which the Pattern Man was perfectly possessed. The abundance of supernatural grace which belonged to Him by right was sufficient to ennoble all His brethren. Their title, therefore, is no individual birthright—no natural superiority to the residue of mankind—but that those privileges, which belonged to the Head of the Church by right, belonged to His Members[1] by favour. On this ground similar titles were bestowed even upon the Jewish people, because their prospective participation in the promised Mediator gave them some portion in His honours. Now, if this be the ground of that claim which is made for individual Christians, how can it be interfered with by that medium of intercourse with Christ, on which its very existence is dependent? For it is to Christ, as man, that the title belongs of right, in which all Christians claim to participate. Now, it is for the very end of providing a channel of intercourse with the man's nature of Christ, that all Church ordinances have been provided. Their professed purpose is to add members to His body. So long, then, as the Christian

[1] Vide Bede on Revelation xx. 4; S. Aug. *De Civit. Dei*, xx. 10.

Sacrifice and Priesthood are merely made a means of union with the manhood of Christ, they cannot interfere with the privilege of individual Christians. As the same terms of royalty and Priesthood, when applied in their degree to the Jewish nation, were rendered available through the efficacy of that national Ritual, whereby the whole people was united to God, so the existence of such common worship as involves the reality of a Christian Priesthood, is the very means of their maintenance in the Church of Christ. The simple *name* of a Christian Priesthood cannot be objected to as incompatible with the right of Christians, for otherwise, to monopolize the title of king would be equally inconsistent with their kingly honour. So that such Priesthood and such sacrifices in the Church of Christ as are the means of maintaining the connexion between Christ and His brethren, are no disparagement to their birthright, but supply the very basis on which it is dependent.

We come then to the other objection. Is the continuance of a sacerdotal system incompatible with the prerogative of Christ? Those who deny that a priesthood and sacrifice exist under the Gospel, suppose that they interfere in some way with the propitiatory office, which is admitted on all hands to belong exclusively to Christ. But why are they supposed to interfere with it? If, indeed, Christ's work was entirely concluded when He was upon earth—if when He had removed certain disabilities which attached to man's position, He left men to find their way to heaven as they could, with the help perhaps of that general influence of the Great Spirit of the Universe, in which all ages and nations have believed—then indeed no place is left for the present action of a sacerdotal system. But this would be to renounce belief in Christ's "continual sacrifice"—to explain away the reality of His Intercession, and the truth of His nature—and to forget that He retains that manhood whereby He has become the new Head of our race. Now, if Christ is still maintaining a real intercession—if He still pleads that sacrifice, in the merit whereof we must partake if we would be truly

joined to His man's nature—then is there ample place for that sacerdotal system by which some actual *thing* is to be still effected, and in which some agents must be still employed. Now, this it is which is asserted by St. Ignatius and St. Irenæus, when they maintain that there exists an altar and a sacrifice in the Church of Christ. They maintain the reality of those acts of Christ in which we participate through the intervention of His ministers. So that the real dispute is whether anything is still *done* by the God-man in His Gospel Kingdom; or whether, as the Sabellians maintain, His work is over, and His office at an end. For if anything is still transacted, so that for its participation there need certain acts, and the service of certain agents, we have an exact precedent in the Jewish system for bestowing the name of sacrifice and priesthood upon the media which are thus employed.

Now, to this it may be replied, that the Jewish system was a temporary provision, which was superseded by the Gospel. The High Priest, it may be said, stood formerly in the place of Christ; and therefore now that the true Priest is come, a typical Priest would not only be superfluous but intrusive. Such is the common argument: but such is not the argument employed by the writer to the Hebrews. His assertion is, not that the Levitical Priesthood was so real and efficacious, that had it continued, the Priesthood of Christ would have been supererogatory; but on the contrary, that had Christ's Priesthood, like the Levitical, been only earthly and typical, there would have been no use in the transition from the one system to the other. "If He were upon earth He should not be a Priest, seeing that there *are* Priests, that offer gifts according to the law." Christ is asserted, therefore, to be a Priest, not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchizedec. And the reason why the Jewish Ritual has passed away, is because now that the True Sacrifice is offered, the media of commemoration have taken the place of the media of prediction. Had there been more than this in the Jewish Ritual, how could the Apostles have con-

tinued to observe it? Had it interfered with the work of Christ, it would not have been enough to leave it to die away under the light of the Gospel. It would not have been sufficient for St. Paul to teach men not to trust, he must have forbidden any to practise it. But every privilege, which has been bestowed in God's two great Dispensations, has flowed into them from that central fact of the Mediation of Christ, which has been the quickening principle of both. For on it alone both the Old and New Testament were dependent, and in its blessings the old and new Election, though in different degrees, have been partakers. Neither could inferior officers or means in either Covenant supersede that Mediation of Christ, to which they were subordinate. Their sole purpose was to carry it out, to turn men to it, to unite them into such system and harmony, that they might profit by the blessings which it conveys. This is all which can be done by the ministers of Christ's Church; and all which could be done by the ministers of God's temple. And the very reason why we put the priestly office under the Law in a line with the ministerial office under the Gospel—why we assert that if the title of Priest could be given fitly to the first, it belongs also to the second—is, that otherwise we should place men on the same level with Christ, and derogate from His peculiar character. For to allow this distinction would be to assign too little to the Mediation of Christ, and too much to the priesthood of men. It were to assign too little to Christ to say *merely*, that when earthly priests had been long offering their insufficient sacrifices, He appeared in the fulness of time to offer that which was perfective and complete. Christ's office as Priest is the consequence of His nature: it differs in kind from the same work or title as discharged by others; it cannot be referred to the same rank, or compared with things which are incommensurable with it. Any persons who discharge an office which has reference to God, and who present to Him what is offered by men, may be *called* Priests (as was Melchizedec, because a type of Christ), but this no more places them in the

same class with Christ, than the title of Son as bestowed upon Him assimilates Him to the partakers in earthly sonship. That He is called Son and Priest in Scripture is no reason for degrading Him to the class of earthly Priests, or earthly children. For His priestly office flows directly from that conjunction of two natures, whereby He is Mediator between God and man. This rendered Him by nature such a real representative of our race towards God, as earthly Priests can be only by office and appointment. Except for this true conjunction of Godhead and manhood, no acceptable offering could be rendered by man to God. As He is the only channel through whom graces flow from God to man, so is He the only medium through which worship ascends from man to his Maker. This is the very cause for that system of the Church, whereby men are truly unit-d to Him, and have a real share in His Intercession. Now, to assert that if Priests existed under the second as under the first Covenant, His sole and inalienable office would be impaired, is to allow that the Aaronic Priests are to be put in the same class with Him, and that they executed a function which He afterwards discharged. The perpetuation of a corresponding office could not interfere with the work of Christ, unless the priesthood of the sons of Aaron would have interfered with Him. And thus is He degraded to a mere functionary who exercised a certain work by appointment, instead of being that great High Priest who is our Mediator by nature.

And as this is to assign too little to Christ, so it is to assign too much to men. For if the Aaronic Priesthood is looked at in itself, and independently of Him, how could it do anything towards man's salvation? It is a general declaration that it is "not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." The importance then which was assigned to the Jewish law, and the benefits which were derived from it, show that it was only relevant to Christ—that its force depended on the constant application of Christ's merits—that its object was to bring men into union with Him—and that except with this

reference it was a splendid fiction.[1] This assertion is as true respecting those media of communion which were used before the time of Christ, as respecting those which have been employed since His Advent; for it is only through "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," that the offerings of men, whether before or since, could be acceptable. If it be said therefore that a Christian priesthood is needless, because the work of Mediation is discharged by Christ alone; the answer is, that such an argument proves a Jewish priesthood to have been useless also. If it be added that a Christian priesthood interferes with the sole merits of Christ, by providing another way of approaching God, why then did not the Jewish priesthood the same? If men answer that the latter was specially appointed to show beforehand the Lord's death, is not a system of ministering equally required to fulfil the allotted office of showing "the Lord's death till he come?"[2] But in truth, neither the

[1] The contrary notion has led to the opinion adopted by some German Rationalists, in order to get rid of the predictions of Christ in the Old Testament, that all which the Prophets had in their minds in their description of the Christian covenant, was that the purer system of Monotheism was to be diffused among the Heathen by the Jewish nation. "Rosenmüller," says Gesenius, on Isaiah xlix., "finds here the expansion of the idea that the people of Israel was hereafter to be the Instructor of the Heathen, and to spread true religion in the earth. He cites Isaiah lxi. 5, 6, according to which all Israelites were hereafter to be Priests, and Joel iii. 1, which implies that in the golden age they were all to be Prophets."—*Comment.* vol. iii. p. 123. The mistake has arisen from forgetting that the office of Prophet or Priest, whether under the old or new Covenant, is not distinct from the true exercise of these offices by the Pattern Man, but is included in it, and is its earthly expression. All Priests and Prophets are mediators by office so long as HE acts and speaks in them who is Mediator by nature.

[2] Sacrifice, "as practised before the time of Christ, may justly be considered as a *Sacramental memorial* showing forth the Lord's death till He came; and when accompanied with a due faith in the promises made to the early believers, may reasonably be judged to have been equally acceptable with that Sacramental memorial, which has been enjoined by our Lord Himself to His followers for the *showing forth His death until His coming again.*"—*Magee on Atonement*, i. 61. This statement is no doubt correct, in that it puts the sacrificial system under the law in the same line with that under the Gospel; but to speak of the former as "*equally* acceptable" with the latter is to forget that the Jewish sacrifices were types, while the Christian sacrifice is a reality. The "burnt-offerings" of the Law can

one nor the other office has any tendency, when rightly viewed, to lead men away from Christ, their only object being to conduct men to Him. The Manichees indeed, who thought the ancient law a mischievous obstruction, which shut men out from the Good Spirit of the Universe, might entertain similar notions of the system whereby men are united to the body of Christ.[1] But those who admit the divine authorship of that law under which the ancient Priests ministered to Christ by type and sacrifice, need not doubt that the ministration of public officers in His Church, may in like manner enable men to profit by His Mediation. There is nothing in the privilege of Christians, nor in the work of Christ Our Lord, inconsistent with such intervention. It is an intervention which unites, and does not separate. For it is obviously essential to that common and united worship, which has been shown to be the appointed means of union with the mystical body of Christ. So that an ordained ministry and public Ritual may be concluded to be required of necessity in the Church of God.

V. It has been shown that it is nowise inconsistent with the Doctrine of our Lord's Mediation, that the Christian ministry

no more be paralleled with the "one perpetual sacrifice for sins" (Heb. x. 12), than "the ministration written and engraven in stones" with "the ministration of the Spirit."

[1] That which Rationalists dislike in the Old Testament is, that it represents the system of Mediation as an advance on the system of nature. Now, if man had access to God through the natural intercourse of mind with mind, as Adam had before the Fall, any step towards the system of Mediation would be a derogation from the prerogative of nature. For what would Priest and Altar be, but an intrusion which obstructed the natural intercourse of the mind with its unembodied Creator? Hence Socinians represent the Law, together with the whole system of Mediation to which it conducted, as a concession to the infirmities of an uncivilized age, which could not rise to the level of an intellectual religion. And even those Christian writers who reject the Sacramental system of the Church, are led to speak of "the Law and Levitical arrangement" as "introduced in God's anger" [Bunsen's *Kirche der Zukunft*, p. 77], as though it were a diminution of that means of intercourse with God, which men before possessed. For since the Sacramental system is the complete and full expression of that presence of an Incarnate Mediator, of which the Levitical scheme was the preliminary shadow, it is impossible that those who reject the one should do justice to the other.

should equally with the Jewish be called a priesthood, and that its service should equally be styled a sacrifice. And it has been stated what is that true and only sacrifice, on the pleading whereof depends the office of both systems; the one by typical representation—the other by Sacramental union. As yet, however, nothing has been adduced but reasons for expecting a Christian ministry to exist; it is necessary to show further the fact of its existence. Now, it is essential to notice what it is which Scripture declares on this subject, and on what it is silent. The existence of a public Ritual and Ministry it declares either expressly or by implication: their nature, order, and mode of appointment are less clearly expressed. The existence of a public ministry follows (independently of various historical and incidental statements in Scripture) from that central portion of the Christian Revelation with which we are particularly engaged. For the Doctrine of Our Lord's Incarnation, which is the beginning and end of the Gospel, declares to us that the renewal of man's nature is effected through union with the manhood of Christ. All the supernatural gifts of grace were first concentrated in this representative of the human race and Head of the Christian family [*vide cap.* 10], that from His manhood they might afterwards flow forth for the replenishment of His brethren. Again, this union is declared to be vouchsafed to us in that mystical body of Christ Our Lord, in which all Christians are engrafted [*vide cap.* 11]. Again, our means of partaking in the mystical body of Christ has been shown (in the present chapter) to be participation in its common actions. Those common actions, therefore, are essential to the effect of the Incarnation of Christ. And if there be public acts, there must be public agents; a ministry or system of some sort or other must be essential to the existence of that collective order whereby individuals become members of the body of Christ. What is asserted then as a Scriptural truth and necessary doctrine is, that some public order and worship, with all which it implies, must for ever exist in the Church of God. And by

common worship is not to be understood that Christians have the right of meeting together, and those who please the right of uttering their minds (a thing which here is neither affirmed nor denied), but that the Church of Christ, regarded as a whole, has certain duties incumbent on it towards God—that those duties involve united worship, common action, a public service, and arise from that collective character, which is stamped on the whole Christian community by its spiritual union with the body of its Incarnate God. To forego this relation is to leave the high ground of the Christian Revelation, and to descend to the uncertainty of mere natural religion. It is to rest on that immediate relation to God through the intercourse of mind with mind, which belonged to unfallen man, but which since the Fall can only be restored through the intervention of a Mediator. So that to suppose the individual duties of religion to be anterior to common worship or independent of it, is virtually to abandon the Mediation of Christ. For all the private prayers, thoughts, actions of Christians, depend on that union with Christ Our Lord, which is attained through the communication of His man's nature. And He communicates it through those public acts, whereby the Great Head of the Christian body joins all its members to Himself.

Now, when it is further demanded by whom are these public acts done, in what circumstances, under whose presidence and authority, we can only refer to the practice of the Church, as she has been guided "into all truth" by the Holy Ghost, and to the example which was set by the Apostles. It has been God's will that in this as in many other cases, the New Testament should not comprise such an exact code of laws as was afforded by the Old. That the several Books which compose the New Testament are inspired, and that they contain the rule of our faith, are facts of which we are assured, because it was always so held by the Apostles and their successors, although no such statement occurs in Holy Writ. That worship should be solemnized especially on the first day of the week, so that we

are authorized to depart from the letter of the Fourth Commandment, rests on the same authority. We have no other proof that children are fit partakers of Baptism, or women of the Holy Eucharist. In all these cases we take as our guide the example of the Apostles. In like manner must we act in regard to the nature and mode of that public agency, whereby the united acts of the Christian community have their expression. That such united action exists, and that there must be a public system of worship, we believe on the authority of Scripture, and because they are indissolubly bound to the highest doctrines of religion. And the existence of such a system, even in the opinion of those who are least inclined to rest the Church's being on any doctrinal basis, involves the necessity of agents by whom it may be conducted. "Any one who sanctions a society," says Archbishop Whately, "gives, in so doing, his sanction to those essentials of a society, its government, its officers, its regulations. Accordingly if Our Lord had not expressly said anything about 'binding and loosing,' still the very circumstance of His sanctioning a Christian community, would necessarily have implied His sanction of the institutions, ministers, and government of a Christian Church." [1] Since the existence, then, of a system of common worship is a truth of Scripture, and since it implies the existence of a ministry, all that remains is to ask the nature and constitution of that ministry; and if on this subject Scripture has given us no express rule, yet, as in the other cases mentioned, some guidance may be derived from the example of the Apostles.

This accordingly has been the course adopted by the English Church. She prefaces her enforcement of the rule of Episcopacy by declaring that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." As we trace back from the present time, we find this rule to have universally

[1] *Kingdom of Christ*, p. 151.

prevailed among the spiritual predecessors of our present ministry. Each generation has professed to receive its commission from Christ through the intervention of the preceding one. Even Archbishop Whately allows, that "The existence of such an order of men as Christian ministers, continuously from the time of the Apostles to this day, is perhaps as complete a moral certainty as any historical fact can be."[1] And when we draw near its fountain, we have the direct testimony of Tertullian, who lived shortly after St. John, that its first rank had its commission handed on to it by that Apostle of Christ:[2] and St. Ignatius, St. John's contemporary, declares its intervention essential to the validity of sacred ordinances. This is sufficient ground for justifying the English Church in her assertion of the Apostolical descent of the three orders of ministers. It is a further question whether this Apostolical succession is so essential, that any break in it would impair the validity of sacred rites. Without entering upon the higher considerations of which the subject admits, it is sufficient to reply that such an inquiry is as needless, as to ask whether the Church could safely reverse the appointment of the Lord's Day, or unsettle the observance of infant Baptism. In all such cases to follow the Apostolic example is plainly the right, because it is the safest course. Since the purpose of a ministry is to keep up that public order, whereby we hold perpetual communion with the Lord's Body, any departure from its constituted usage is a needless risk. It is alleged, indeed, that to rest anything on the perpetuation of a chain, which contains so many links, is to subject our religious hopes to a painful uncertainty. This is to forget that the Apostolical succession only supplies those who believe it with an additional security, over and above what others possess. Since each Bishop has commission from three of his brethren, its effect, if traced back a few generations, is to identify his individual authority with that of the whole Episcopate of the Church.

[1] *Kingdom of Christ*, p. 222.
[2] Tert. adv. Marcionem, iv. 5.

Were it not that the same parties repeatedly consecrate, every Bishop would have two hundred and sixteen spiritual predecessors in the fifth degree; and it can scarcely be doubted, therefore, that by going back a few years, his commission must have been transmitted by the whole body of his forerunners. The feeling thus engendered may be illustrated by that which prevailed among pious Israelites, from the hope that Our Lord would descend from them according to the flesh. Considering the vast number of ancestors which each individual had in the twenty-seventh generation, there can scarcely have been a Jewish parent in the time of David, if we except those whose progeny became absolutely extinct, who was not, according to the flesh, a predecessor of Our Lord. So truly was He the heir of the nation. And in like manner there can scarcely have been a Bishop in the Primitive Church—much less could there be one among the Apostles—through whom every individual inheritor of the Episcopal office may not trace his commission. Surely such a fact is not calculated to weaken the feeling of the Church's unity, or to relax that bond whereby all the members of the Lord's Body are united to Himself. And if it be said that there may in some case have been a secret failure, which may have impaired some one of the many parallel threads by which this bond is rendered continuous, such a circumstance, instead of being fatal to the general law, seems the very exception for which some great Divines have contended—that an *involuntary* breach of this Apostolical rule is not fatal to the Church's existence. If we saw persons whose descent we were unable to trace to Adam, but whose acts and character showed an exact congruity with those of his children, we should suppose that it had pleased God in some way to us unknown, to amalgamate them with mankind. It would not be an unnatural exercise of faith, to believe that God is pleased in like manner to supply the involuntary deficiencies of those who desire to be identified with His Church's existence.

But why, it may be asked, do we refer to this Apostolical

commission, if it be not expressly affirmed to be essential? It ought not to be assumed, however, because Christ Our Lord might have adopted a different rule in the perpetuation of His Church, that therefore the rule of Apostolical succession is not essential, now that He has been pleased to adopt it. Those who feel how much depends on the reality of the ordinances, whereby we participate in the Mediation of Christ, will think every step in such a series essential. But independently of the higher ground upon which this question might be rested, it would be a sufficient reason for vindicating the commission of Christian ministers, that it contributes to a reverent estimate of those public acts of the Christian Body, from which the contrary tendency proportionably detracts. The thing of moment is the truth that common worship is a real work, whereby the whole Christian community preserves its right as the collective body of the Lord. Its claim to a true life in Him is thereby asserted, just as the privileges of Israel belonged to all who had a part in its united Ritual. By this means are we led to appreciate those external actions of the God-man, on which His character of Mediator is dependent. Nothing hinders, indeed, but that the like results might have attended common worship, though it had been God's pleasure that the public officers, by whom it is directed, instead of being set apart for their work, had been chosen out of the mass for the occasion. But if common worship be really of the moment which has been described, such manner of selecting those who guide it could not be esteemed so suitable as that which has been handed down from the Apostles. Even on natural grounds, then, we need not wonder that those who have adopted such an expedient, have either begun or ended by depreciating the work itself. Instead of being an office which has reference to God, and may therefore be properly called sacred or divine, the task of ministering has before long been looked upon only in its reference to man, and as little else than that of an instructor. Thus the notion of common worship passes away. The collective sacrifice of the people's prayers is lost

sight of. So that, beginning by neglecting the example of the Apostles, men have ended by disbelieving their doctrines. The life of the Christian community as the Body of Christ has been destroyed. His Mediation, whereby God and man are united, has been explained away into a mere natural religion. The necessity of being joined to His man's nature has been forgotten. Such has been the actual result in very many of those communities where the line of a living ministry has been broken. And to add to this tendency, where the ancient system of the ministry has been abandoned, the ancient Ritual and Liturgy have commonly been renounced. Here too the practice of early times, so far as it can be attained, affords a useful example; especially in points of such leading moment as the ministering of Sacraments. But the material point is that such form of service should be maintained as may testify to the collective character of the Church's supplications. This is the very purpose of a public Liturgy, which, by calling on the people to bear their part, finds place for the service of the whole community. Where this responsive system of worship is lost, the nature of a public service will soon be forgotten. Instead of regarding the minister as a public servant, whose office is to provide a centre of union for their collective prayers, men will look to him mainly as a teacher, whose office is not to address God, but themselves. The very place of assemblage, instead of being known as God's "House of Prayer," will be associated with the recollection of some favoured preacher. And the sure consequence will be a forgetfulness of the peculiar relation which men gain in common worship to Christ the Mediator, to whom at that moment they should address themselves as members of the one mystical body in heaven and earth, for which He is interceding at His Father's right hand." [1]

[1] It must have been because this united system of worship witnesses in so striking a manner to the collective existence of Christ's body, that it was so early complained of by the enemies of the English Church. Witness the objection made at Frankfort to the system of responding. The Church people, it was said, "began to break that order which was agreed upon,

Nothing has more contributed to the growth of that unbelief which has overspread many parts of the Continent, than the evil which has been described. For with the collective character of worship, that real life of the Church has been lost, which depends on Christ's presence. The preservation of this among ourselves has not been owing merely to our attachment to great names or orthodox expressions, however important; for Christ only can maintain that quickening spirit which He bestows through the ordinances of His grace. From Himself must come the power which is sought through those federal acts which unite men in His mystical body. A neglect of those especial means by which this union is effected, issues in a practical undervaluing of the union itself. The Incarnation of Christ ceases to be looked upon as the source of His continual presence among men, and a system of self-mediation grows up in its place. The glowing words in which Scripture describes the privileges of Christians, are regarded as something bestowed on them as individuals, as a re-assertion of the claims of nature, and as though by themselves they had access to God; whereas it is only through their great Head that these blessings devolve on them. The royal and priestly nature has been shown not to belong to them in themselves, but by union with Him who by His Mediation has joined them to God. As fallen humanity was

in answering aloud after the minister."—*Phenix*, vol. ii. 72. See also the irreverent remarks of Knox on the affecting appeals to the man Christ Jesus in our Litany.—*Vide Letter to Calvin*, *Phenix*, ii. 65. The evil of yielding to such objections is acknowledged by the Lutheran Olshausen. "The worship of the Church," he says, "is an enduring sacrifice of thanks, which, for His enduring sacrifice of atonement, is offered to Our Lord. To this element of Prayer, the Romish Church had unduly given an exclusive predominance: the Lutheran Church has as unduly made it subordinate to the personal acts of the preacher, and to his sermon; whereas the minister ought not to be considered merely as a preacher, but also as a real Liturgist, *i.e.*, as the organ through which the devotion of the congregation is conveyed. Public worship accordingly consists of two different parts, the preaching of the Gospel, whether to convert the unbeliever or instruct the Christian; and the service of supplication, the crowning act whereof is the Holy Eucharist, the Church's great thank-offering, in which Christ's sacrifice of Mediation is symbolically set forth."

first re-consecrated by union with the divine nature in Christ our Head, so all consecrating virtue is bestowed upon His servants through that union with Him which belongs to them as members of His mystical body. So that to abandon the connexion which is maintained by the public ordinances of His grace, is to renounce that highest birthright of man's race, which is bestowed upon it through the Mediation of Christ. It is a bold statement of Dr. Bisse, in relation to the importance of daily service, that the "mother Churches, the sure resting-place for the Ark of the Covenant, before which the daily offering never ceaseth to be offered morning and evening—these are our strength and salvation, and are of far greater use and security to our people and to our land, than all the watchfulness of our senators, or policy of our ambassadors, or valour of our mighty men."[1] What was present to his mind was, that by this collective service is maintained our connexion with that Mediation of the Son of God from which flow the highest privileges of humanity. This no doubt is the Church's reason for requiring the public ministration of daily service, except when "reasonably hindered," of all her clergy. And well were it if all who take part in public prayer, and especially all who worship in those central Churches, wherein the whole diocese has a common interest, would remember how high and responsible is the office which they undertake. For not only those who officiate, but all who take part in public prayer, are thereby uniting themselves to that great work, of which the head and Leader is the Son of God Himself. This belongs to the laymen who present prayers, as well as to the Priest whose office is to give them united voice and utterance. If the High Priest in ancient times bore with Him into God's presence the symbols of the whole world, and claimed to be its common minister, much more so does the Christian, the heir of the world, for whose sake were the dispensations which are past, and on whom the "ends of the world have come." On this account is man

[1] *Rationale of Cathedral Worship*, pp. 53, 54.

emphatically called "the creature"[1] in Holy Writ, because he is the heir and representative of God's creation. A lofty title —but whereto One Only Individual has right in Himself, and which, if others attempt to claim it for themselves, will but minister to their more signal overthrow. Those who seek to rule the world by themselves, or who claim for themselves its possession, do but demonstrate the imbecility of worldly talents, and the instability of worldly success. The heir of the world, the ruler of the creation of God, is that Man only whom a nature which was above humanity marked out to be the "first-born of every creature." In the elder son, all the prerogatives of birthright were exclusively inherent. To Him only do those titles belong of right, which He bestows upon all His brethren by favour. He is the sole King, the only Priest: but they are all heirs, so far as they are one with Him, in a Kingly and Priestly line. That sacerdotal system, whereby we maintain communion with His man's nature, instead of derogating, as some have imagined, from the privilege of individual Christians, is the very circumstance on which their tenure rests. On the maintenance of their federal union with Him depends their pre-eminence. To let go this connexion is to fall back into the imbecility of their natural state. Those public ordinances therefore, through which as Mediator He unites them to His own manhood, are the very life of theirs. To be found in Him their representative is to share His honour, because it is to share His nature. "For Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. And hast made us unto our God Kings and Priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

[1] When God made the world He impressed the seal of Creation upon man, as on a scrap of parchment one writes the name and number of a whole year. Therefore is man called in God's words "all Creation."—*St. Hildegard, as quoted in Olshausen on St. Mark* xvi. 15.

CHAPTER XIII.

OF SACRAMENTS, AS MEANS OF UNION WITH THE MANHOOD OF CHRIST.

The action of Christ towards men since His Ascension have been said to be involved in the truth of His presence. His Presence has been explained to be that spiritual presence of His manhood whereon all the functions of His Mediation depend. It is vouchsafed in His body mystical, the Church; and the offices of common worship, speaking comprehensively, are the means whereby men partake it. But there is one means of partaking it, so specific, peculiar, and signal, as to need separate notice—namely, Sacramental grace.

Something has already been said respecting the Holy Communion as a sacrifice, a view, however, of this sacred ordinance, of which its character as a Sacrament is the root. For it is by virtue of the connexion into which it brings men with Christ that it forms the leading feature of our public service, so that its relation to worship arises from that which is the characteristic and original distinction both of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. There are other purposes which they serve, and other views which may be taken of them, but that circumstance on which all the rest depend, and which especially connects itself with the present inquiry, is that Sacraments are "the extension of the Incarnation;"[1] that through these means we are united to the man's nature of Christ. Other particulars which distinguish them are, First, that in Sacraments there is the performance of a definite and peculiar act, which is likely to engender in us peculiar preparation. Hence as our Article observes, they are "badges or tokens of Christian men's profession." Christian

[1] Taylor's *Worthy Communicant*, i. 2. He says, p. 30: "The Fathers, by an elegant expression, call the blessed *Sacraments* the extension of the Incarnation."

burial consequently is not allowed except to those who have been partakers of Baptism, and who have not been formally excluded from the Holy Communion. Now, this circumstance may not unfitly suggest the cautious preparation with which we should approach rites by which we are especially dedicated to God's service. But this is only a first, and as our Article is careful to observe, only a partial estimate of Sacraments: it rests their use on our act only, not on that of God: it is merely subjective, human, tentative, and though useful as a direction to ourselves, falls far short of the sublime views which Scripture opens respecting these "holy mysteries." It is such conception as a Socinian might entertain, but with which the Christian mind could never be satisfied.

We pass on then to the second purpose which our Article assigns to Sacraments, *i.e.*, that they are "not only badges of profession," "but rather" "certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace." Here, then, we have a divine, as before a mere human meaning in these sacred ordinances. They are not only subjective, as implying a feeling in ourselves, but objective likewise, as implying an act external to us on the part of the Almighty. "Christ and His Holy Spirit, with all their blessed effects, though entering into the soul of man we are not able to apprehend or express how, do notwithstanding give notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth Almighty God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible."[1] This then is no doubt the peculiar end of Sacraments, that they are channels to the faithful of those supernatural gifts, whereby God renews the soul. And herein their tangible nature has this peculiar advantage, that it turns men's minds more completely to their Almighty Author, so that in times of doubt they are a stable comfort, and yet in times of steadfastness do not minister to pride. Their advantage in time of doubt is, that their ground is God's promise and not man's confidence: so that they supply

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 57, 3.

some fixed external standing-place in those hours of dejection, when men's own feelings are in most need of succour. In such seasons comfort must come from without, for how are inward doubts to be solved by the mind, whose very complaint is doubtfulness? In such moments, then, how inestimable that gift, whereby "Thou dost assure us of Thy favour and goodness towards us." And yet such succour contains this antidote to pride, that whereas all inward movements of man's soul, even though we admit them to be God's works, may yet blend and confuse themselves with our own agency; on the contrary, "where God doth work and use these outward means, wherein He neither findeth nor planteth force and aptness towards His intended purpose, such means are but signs to bring men to the consideration of His own omnipotent power, which without the use of things sensible would not be marked."[1] This then being the main purpose of Sacraments, and there being some peculiar advantages in the very simplicity of the vehicles which God has chosen for the communication of His gifts, we may yet go further, and inquire how far they connect themselves with His general dealings with mankind, and whether this connexion supplies any circumstances which explain what appears at first sight their anomalous nature. For what indisposes the minds of many to the doctrine of Sacramental grace, is that it seems so completely a matter of *arbitrary appointment*. They require to discern greater congruity between the effect attained and the means of obtaining it. We are used to see cause and effect linked together by a chain of interdependent circumstances; and the gap between a slight external act and a momentous internal alteration is intolerable to our fancy. Say what men will, the judgment revolts at it; man's faith is not strong enough for such a trial. This is why all the learned works which have been written on the Sacraments fail to give confidence in their efficacy; the unbelief which is vanquished in the study re-appears in the world, and men acquiesce in the

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* vi. 6, 11.

formularies of the Church, but their reason remains unsatisfied. What they need, as Hooker expresses it after St. Augustin, is some "answer, such as not only may press them with the bare authority of custom, but also instruct them in the cause thereof."

Now such a cause seems to be supplied by that particular subject with which we are at present occupied. The importance of Sacraments rests on the Incarnation of Christ, and on their being the means through which His man's nature is communicated to His brethren. Let this be apprehended, and what offends men in their arbitrary appointment will pass away. For since this is a wholly supernatural work, we could not expect to see it effected, except through some means specifically provided by God's peculiar appointment; and the visible means employed are so far from appearing to be less suitable than any other, with which the wisdom of God could have connected the secret working of His power, that in several respects we can discern them to be singularly appropriate. If man's connexion with the Supreme Being were the mere natural intercourse of mind with mind—if man were still, as Adam was before the Fall, the perfect image of his Maker, then indeed to introduce such media of communication at all would be superfluous. And on this account the Sacramental system is inconsistent with that Rationalistic theory, which supposes that the divine principle of holiness and truth is sufficiently possessed by nature. But allow the scheme of Mediation to be essential to man's recovery, let it depend on union with that Personal Being in whom holiness and truth became incarnate, and the Sacramental system follows of course. In the mere intercourse of mind with mind, Sacraments would be an unnatural interruption: but they are exactly suited to effect that union whereby the Divine Head of man's race is bound to His fellows. Since this union is itself foreign to the course of nature, so must the media be by which it is effected; the work cannot depend on their natural influence, but on that influence with which they are super-

naturally endowed. And that those outward means which we call Sacraments are truly attended by an inward effect, that what is done on earth in holy mysteries effects a real change in the whole nature of those who are acted upon, is known to us by the distinct declarations of God's Word. We are told in plain and indubitable terms that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the means by which men are joined to the body of Christ, and therefore by which Christ Our Lord joins Himself to that renewed race of which He has become the Head. So that, as St. Leo expresses it, "He that is received by Christ, and that receives Christ, is not the same after the laver of baptism as he was before it, because *the body of the regenerate person becomes the flesh of the crucified one.*"[1] Now, these facts we learn from the express statements of St. Paul. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."[2] And again, "We being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread."[3] Herein it is expressly declared that the one and the other of these Sacraments are the peculiar means by which union with the body of Christ is bestowed upon men. They are the "joints and bands" whereby the whole body in its dependence on its Head has nourishment ministered. So that it is in the Church that union takes place with Christ, the new Adam or representative of our race, and it is by this actual union with the New Adam, that the whole family of renewed men have that collective being, whereby is derived to them their spiritual life.

And this, then, is the circumstance which puts the main difference between Sacraments and those other means of grace, wherein also we draw near to God. The profit of all other means of grace depends on that right of access to God, which Christ the Mediator has dispensed. But the purpose of Sacraments is to bind us to Him on whom this right of access is dependent. Our prayers and praises avail not, unless we are part

[1] S. Leo, Serm. xiv. *De Pass. Dom.* c. 6.
[2] 1 Corinthians xii. 13. [3] 1 Corinthians x. 17.

of that renewed race which our great High Priest has been pleased to identify with Himself, covering the infirmity of their actions with the perfection of His own. But it is through that union of His man's nature with ours, which is compacted through the Sacraments of His grace, that the Head of the body is identified with its members. Thus it is that the whole body is "fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." So that Sacraments differ from all other means of grace in that whereas other things result from union with Christ, they on the contrary conduct to it.[1] Their pre-eminence depends on a real diversity between their office and that of any other things appertaining to divine service, because through them Christ, the Head of mankind, joins Himself to His brethren.

Sacraments, then, differ in purpose from other means of grace, in that through them the Head is united to its members. But why are they especially employed for such an office? What is that congruity which fits them for the work, and what the suitableness which may be found in such external portions of them as address themselves to our sense? It is not for us, of course, to lay down rules for the Omniscient, and yet we may contemplate with reverence what it has been His pleasure to appoint. Now, since the peculiarity of Sacraments is that they are not merely inward actions, but that they touch likewise upon the external world—that they have, in fact, both "an outward visible sign," and "an inward spiritual grace"—this compound nature marks them out as a singularly appropriate medium of intercourse between things, which are themselves compound, *i.e.* man who is to be renewed, and the Mediator whose presence renews him. For thus it is that all graces are

[1] Sacraments, therefore, are not merely an acted prayer; neither is it their main function to teach by example, in which case "where the word of God may be heard, which teacheth with much more expedition and more full explication anything we have to learn, if all the benefit we reap by Sacraments be instruction, they which at all times have opportunity of using the better mean to that purpose, will surely hold the worse in less estimation."—*Eccles. Pol.* v. 57, 1.

communicated to mankind, flowing into them from that manhood which has been made the fountain of grace through its personal oneness with Deity. Now, man consists of a material as well as an immaterial nature, and in body, soul, and spirit, does he require to be renewed after the image of Him that created him. It has not been an uncommon feeling that in the material clay of man's composition lies all his vileness; let him be emancipated only from this, and the pure spirit would expatiate in the freedom of its native refinement. This was the inherent vice of the Gnostic system (p. 93); it resulted from that erroneous philosophy which represented simple immensity as the essence of Godhead, forgetful of those moral conditions, whereby both through conscience and revelation the Father of all has been pleased to declare that His character is most adequately expressed. Thus are men blinded to the deformity of sin, and to the hatefulness of that rebellion against a holy God, which is the real degeneracy of our state. An error this, which is best corrected by remembering that Christ Our Lord took our whole nature, and that our whole nature is to be renovated in Him. "For if our flesh had not admitted of redemption, the Word of God would not have become flesh." [1] And because the terms which are to be united are of this complex character, it is not unnatural that the Sacraments which are appointed to unite them, should show by their very constitution that even the material part of manhood is not to be forgotten. "Hadst thou been incorporeal," says St. Chrysostom, "God would have given thee His gifts in a naked and incorporeal manner. But since thy soul is joined to thy body, the garb of sense is used in conveying a gift to thy mind." [2] Therefore does our Church remind us, that by the baptism of Christ "in Jordan," water was consecrated "to the mystical washing away of sin." The whole element, in all its multiform variety, was freed by this single use of it from the impu-

[1] S. Irenæus, v. 14, 1.
[2] *Hom.* lxxxiii. on *St. Matt.* xxvi.

tation of being naturally impure. So does Irenæus[1] maintain that all the simple ingredients of man's life were purified through their employment by that Head of our race who could not be defiled. To esteem man's spirit something so much purer than his animal nature, that its acts may in themselves find an access to the Deity, which his material nature is unworthy to share, is not very unlike the fanciful heresy of the Gnostic Valentinus. The man Christ, he supposed, having been moulded by the Demiurgus, or maker of the world, with his utmost skill, had received, unknown to his Creator, the seeds of a superior nature from the ultimate author of all, which discovered themselves as he grew up to the astonishment of the being who had produced him, and supplied the point of contact with that divine spirit which descended upon Him at His baptism.[2] There is something almost analogous to this conception in the belief that a part of our nature has in itself a right of access to the holy God, independently of that means of approach which He has bestowed through Christ upon the whole of it. For Christ Our Lord vouchsafed to come in the perfection of our nature, that all might be renewed. The representative of our race took our being in its completeness, that it might be wholly sanctified. "For we could not taste of incorruption and immortality, unless we had first been united to that which is immortal and incorruptible. But how should we be united to that which was incorruptible and immortal, unless He who was personally incorruption and immortality had first been made the same with ourselves, that so what was corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruption, and what was mortal by immortality, that we might receive the adoption of sons?"[3] The course then which God's infinite wisdom was pleased to adopt was, that since "the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself" (in the Person of the Eternal Son) "took part of the same." "He summed up the

[1] S. Iren. iii. 11, 5.

[2] Dorner's *Person Christi*, i. p. 377.

[3] S. Iren. iii. 19, 1.

lengthened series of mankind in Himself, affording us salvation in that epitome of our being; that what we had lost in Adam, *i.e.*, to be after God's image and likeness, we might recover in Christ."[1] Thus then was there "one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." There was one common bond by which these two infinitely distant parties might be united. And this common term of union required to be truly and really joined to each of the extremes, which it was to couple to one another. It was truly joined to Godhead by that Personal union whereby Christ our Lord was very God, of very God. The very nature of Godhead—whole God—was in the Person of the Son of Mary united to our flesh. "God was manifest in the flesh." All glory, purity, perfection, power, of which Godhead could not be emptied, were enshrined in a human frame. Thus there was sown a seed of life and immortality, which was to interpenetrate and pervade the whole nature of mankind. For this end, as the man Christ Jesus was joined to Deity by Personal union, so is He allied to His brethren of mankind by Sacramental grace. For "we are members of His body; of His flesh, and of His bones." "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." Now, this union of the Mediator with men, whereby are transmitted to them those beams of glory which were centred in His flesh, needs to be as true and certain as that other union which He has with Godhead, whereby its self-originating excellencies were transferred into Himself. As the fountain has its source in those unknown waters which issue from the throne of God, so from the fountain do the streams descend to water the earth. In the union, then, of God's nature with manhood in the Person of Christ lies the cause of our union with the man Christ Jesus by Sacramental grace. If the first be received as a true, real, abiding fact, such as can be founded only on that diversity of Persons in the Ever-Blessed Trinity, which forms the basis of the Christian system, the second also will be looked at not as a

[1] S. Iren. iii. 18, 1.

mere figurative expression, but as an actual operation. But let the first be denied, as by Socinians, or by Sabellians be resolved into a mere nominal transaction, and the reality of the second must evaporate. Therefore does St. Athanasius observe, that a denial of the Personality of God the Son, of necessity involves a denial of the grace of Baptism.[1] Or on the other hand, let our hold on that union which couples men with Christ be forgotten, and the functions of the Mediator will become an office discharged by some manifestation of the Divine Power, rather than the result of God's actual oneness with our nature. So essential is each link in this golden chain to the integrity of the rest.[2]

[1] Or. iv. in Arian. c. 25.

[2] The intimate connexion between Our Lord's humanity and the Sacramental system has been repeatedly evidenced by the inclination of those who disparage the one to explain away the other. So that in a belief of the Sacramental system lies the guard against that Rationalistic tendency which was so solemnly denounced by the beloved Apostle, as characteristic of Antichrist: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." For it was long ago observed by St. Irenæus, that the reality of the Mediator's influence in the Holy Communion involved the reality of that manhood which it has been His gracious pleasure to share with ourselves. Thus did he answer the Docetæ, who, with the reality of Our Lord's body, denied not only the truth of His sacrifice and efficacy of His atonement, but also the future resurrection of mankind. The line of argument adopted by St. Irenæus has lately been employed by Archbishop Whately, but his contrary premises land him unhappily in a contrary result. In the passage alluded to, the Archbishop makes no reference to the actions of our Lord in time past; he refers only to that present influence of the God-man, which no one can be expected to admit, who resolves the mystery of the Blessed Trinity into mere terms of relation. [Compare p. 116 and p. 233.] In speaking of this present influence of the God-man, Archbishop Whately mounts up from a denial of His efficacy to a denial of His existence. If the Sacraments be merely signs of spiritual power at large, then, he argues, those things on which their peculiar influence as Sacraments is grounded, are only emblematic of the general efficacy of that Being on whom all spiritual action is dependent. Therefore he says, "the bread and wine not only are merely a sign, but are a *sign of a sign*; that is, *they* represent Our Lord's flesh and blood, and His flesh and blood again are a sign of something else" (*Sermons*, p. 265). So that Our Lord's flesh and blood, even if they existed formerly, have now at all events no real existence. His actions as a partaker of our nature have been suspended; He is no longer the "one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." And the Spirit is spoken of as that "of which His flesh and blood are themselves the sign" (Id. p. 250). So that the especial

Now, as the mean of this union between Christians and Christ, the wisdom of God has employed the system of Sacraments. Visible things have been taken, that with them might be associated that inward energy and grace which is the living principle whereby the one of these is bound to the other. The union of the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace make up the Sacrament. "Neither is it *ordinarily*" God's "will to bestow the grace of Sacraments on any but by the Sacraments."[1] And besides other advantages which have been stated to accrue from this appointment, there results from it this peculiar consequence, that the intervention of a means of grace which borrows its vehicle or organ from the external world, is adopted in a case where that which consists both of body and soul, namely each individual of the family of men, is to be joined to that Head or Representative, who consists both of soul and body. Now, because the first effect of union with Christ is the removal of that defilement of our whole being which sin had engendered, this process commences with a rite, which speaks to the outward eye of cleansing and purification. Again, because our subsequent life results from the continual influx of grace from Him whose manhood has become its storehouse, therefore our further acts of union are through a means whereby our souls are strengthened and refreshed "by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by bread and wine." Thus significant is the sensible part of that process, which having its beginning in the truth, "The Word was made flesh," has for its conclusion, "that we might be made partakers of the divine nature." Not that the connecting principle which binds together mankind and their Head in any material derivation. The things united, indeed, are on one side the whole constitution of man as

efficacy of that nature which He assumed with a view to the work of Mediation is resolved into the mere general influence of the Great Unembodied Spirit. Such is the result of denying the efficacy of that Sacramental system through which the Humanity of the Incarnate Son is the medium of bestowing spiritual gifts. As its belief led the disciple of Polycarp to maintain the truth of Christ's nature, so does its rejection involve those errors against which Polycarp's instructor testified.

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 57, 4.

it exists in each individual, and whole Christ on the other. But that whereby they are joined is the spiritual energy by which it has been shown that Christ acts upon His brethren. This energy has been shown to be immaterial, both by reference to what it is and by reference to what it is not. (Cap. x.) For it was to be the mysterious agent in this union, that the Third Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity vouchsafed His gracious concurrence on man's behalf. He came to join men to Christ, to supply the loss which would else have attended Our Lord's Ascension, that He who was withdrawn according to His carnal propinquity might be brought more near by spiritual presence. And the same thing follows from considering what it has been shown that Our Lord's mystical or Sacramental presence is *not*. It is not that local presence of a material body which He maintains in heaven. "Christ as man according to the body is in a place and goes from a place, and when He comes to another place, is not in the place from whence He came."[1] That this local presence, therefore, of Christ's material frame is not upon earth, is the very thing which is asserted, when it is stated to be in heaven.

Here, then, it may be well to pause for a moment, in order to notice what is the exact point which *is*, and what that which *is not* stated respecting the blessed Sacraments.

I. It is not affirmed then that their external or sensible parts are so raised above their natural nothingness, as by their own efficacy to produce a spiritual result. In each Sacrament the outward sign is produced by combining an appointed matter with certain chosen words. Unless the words and matter are properly combined (and hence arises the occasion for such caution and heedfulness[2] in their ministration), there is no Sacrament. But

[1] St. Aust. in Taylor's *Real Presence of Christ*, xi. 15.

[2] Baptism requires that the element of water should be applied *at the same time* with the words of administration. "Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua."—*S. Aug. in Joan.* 80, 3. Vide Maskell's *Holy Baptism*, p. 136. The same principle may be extended to the ordinance of Confirmation; the validity of which depends on the *simultaneous concurrence* of certain words and of a certain action.

neither are these things aught by themselves but sounds or elements, nor when duly combined, though of course hallowed by being consecrated to a holy use, do they cease to be in themselves elements and sounds. For "Sacraments are not physical but *moral instruments* of salvation."[1] This is more readily admitted, perhaps, in the Sacrament of Baptism than in that of the Lord's Supper. Yet "the orthodoxal ancients use the same language for expressing Christ's Presence[2] in Baptism and in the Eucharist: they stick not to say that Christ is present or latent in the water, as well as in the elements of bread and wine. Their meaning is, that neither of these elements or sensible substances can directly cleanse us from our sins, by any virtue communicated into them or inherent in them, but only as they are pledges or assurances of Christ's peculiar presence in them,

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. 57, 4. An able Reviewer objects to these words of Hooker's, and observes, "It is difficult to see what sense can be applied to the word *moral*, which will make it include the whole alternative opposed to physical in this case."—*Christian Remembrancer*, No. 64, p. 330. The expression is open to misconception in the present day, since the efficacy of Sacraments is rested by Rationalists on the action of the human receiver; so that the work of the Divine Giver is practically superseded. Hooker's intention, however, was only to affirm with Lombard that grace cannot be separated from the *personal* action of its divine author; that it is neither embodied in mind nor matter, so as to have any influence independently of Himself. It is as though he asserted that without the sun there can be no sunshine. "Where the instrument is without inherent virtue, the effect must necessarily proceed from the only agent's adherent power."—*Eccl. Pol.* vi. 6, 11. This view is defended by Estius, in *Lib.* 4, *Sent. Dist.* i. 5 (quoted by Dr. Pusey on *Bapt.* p. 127, Ed. 1st), as being that of Scotus, Bonaventura, and others." Sacraments, he says, have not "physicam instrumenti rationem," nor yet "virtutem aliquam creatam eis inesse;" but "divina virtus sacramentis ad producendum gratiæ effectum certo et infallibiliter ex Christi promissione assistit;" and therefore he describes them as "causa instrumentalis," or "instrumentum morale." This statement is separated from that of Aquinas only by a technical and metaphysical distinction, for if he asserts that "gratia est in sacramentis novæ legis instrumentaliter; sicut forma artificiali est in instrumentis artis," he adds, Missio Divinæ Personæ non fit ad sacramenta, sed ad eos, qui per sacramenta gratiam suscipiunt."—*Summa*, 1, Q. 43, 6.

[2] Fulgentius quotes a Sermon of St. Augustin, Serm. 272, as proving "tunc unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque Dominici participem fieri, quando in Baptismate membrum corporis Christi efficitur."—*Bib. Max. Patr.* ix. 178.

and of our true investiture in Christ by them."[1] And as the element in Baptism is on all hands allowed to continue water, so the element in the Holy Eucharist is expressly called bread by St. Paul, even when its Sacramental use is referred to. And, indeed, why should aught else be expected? The only ground for questioning it must be, that Holy Scripture declares the body and blood of Christ to be our food in the Lord's Supper. Now, when we speak of Our Lord's body and blood, the very words lead us of necessity to His manhood, to that same bodily substance which was born of the Virgin, and ascended into heaven after its sufferings on the Cross. It being admitted, then, by all believers that this body is present after some real manner in the Holy Eucharist, those who deny that the consecrated elements continue to be materially bread and wine, must do so under the idea, that without derogating from the local presence of Our Lord's body in heaven, the elements when consecrated become a portion of His material body and blood.[2]

[1] Jackson's Works, x. 55, 9. "It may suffice to believe," says Dr. Jackson, in reference to the water of Baptism, "that this Sacramental pledge hath a virtual presence of Christ's blood, or some real influence from His body, concomitant, though not consubstantiated to it, which is prefigured or signified by the washing or sprinkling the body with water."—*Ibid.* x. 50, 4. Vide Innocentii Ep. in St. Austin's Lett. Ep. 182, 5, vol. 2, p. 640. Not of course that the modes in which the receiver is brought into relation to Our Lord's Humanity in Baptism and in the Holy Eucharist are identical: for the latter depends for its validity upon the consecration of the elements, which is not essential to the former. So that Christ's Body may be said to be present in Baptism, because He is present, whereas He is present in the Holy Communion, because of the presence of His Body.

[2] This passage, remarks a reviewer (*Christian Remembrancer*, No. 64, p. 330), "would seem to imply that according to the view of the Roman Church, the elements when consecrated become a part of Our Lord's material body and blood. There is no such doctrine in her formularies. It is intended that in every portion of the consecrated elements, whole Christ, body, soul, and divinity, is present." The remark is quoted with a view of guarding against the supposition that the opinion opposed in the text is designed to be attributed to the Church of Rome. For it is not intended in this work to say anything respecting her. The sole object proposed is to show that Christ's real presence under the forms of bread and wine is something wholly distinct from that notion, which is popularly understood among ourselves by the term Transubstantiation.

Their reason for maintaining it, if such an opinion is ever really maintained, must be, first, the letter of Scripture, which however all believers accept; and secondly, an impression that unless such transmutation is admitted, there can be no true belief in the efficacy of Sacraments. But it follows from what has been already stated respecting the nature of Our Lord's presence—First, that the consecrated elements, even if they undergo a material change, have no more tendency than without such change to produce the real end which results from Sacraments; and secondly, that to rest on such a change is incompatible with a reference to Our Lord's ascended manhood as that Head of the renewed race with whom it is the purpose of Sacraments to unite us. For in the first place, suppose the consecrated elements to undergo some such change, that they should be found to be, we know not how, the material body of Christ. This would no doubt give them great sacredness; but how would it minister towards the purpose of a Sacrament? Why should we be the better for the carnal devouring of Our Lord's body? What spiritual efficacy would result from such a feast? A spiritual efficacy, indeed, Our Lord's body has on all those with whom according to its proper laws of action it is brought into connexion; but would this action attend its material consumption? Is there any relevance between union with the flesh of the Son of Man and the carnal devouring Him? We are united to Adam by one means, to Christ by another. The first is by the law of paternity, the second by that of regeneration. Why should we increase our relation to Christ by this carnal banquet, any more than we should to Adam by the eating of his flesh? "As is our eating," says Taylor, "so is the nourishing, because that is in order to this."[1] A spiritual effect of the manhood of our Great Head must proceed through spiritual action from His purified humanity. Sacraments have been appointed as its medium of communication; but if Baptism does not depend on the natural effect of the elements which it employs, why should the Lord's Supper?

[1] *Of the Real Presence of Christ*, vii. 8.

Such a supposition at all events is not essential to a belief in the Sacramental system, and to a true acceptance of its divine results.

But further, it may be observed, in the second place, that to rest on a material transmutation in the consecrated elements is, so far forth, to detract from the influence of Our Lord's ascended manhood as Head of the renewed race. For its consequence would be to turn our minds to the natural effect of those sacred elements which we partake, instead of building on the supernatural presence of that ascended manhood, with which it should be our object to be united. The blessing in the one case would be to be fed with heavenly food—in the other to be united to a Divine Person.[1] The first of these would, according to the supposition, be a blessing in itself, independently of the other. So that the main object of Sacraments, their real life, that which separates them from all other means of grace—that in and through them we are joined to the true Head of man's race, and receive those blessings which through a spiritual medium He communicates in holy mysteries to all His members—would become a secondary consideration. Accordingly, those ancient writers who most insist on the real presence and action of Christ's manhood in holy mysteries, declare plainly that the human body and blood which are ascended into heaven are not carnally consumed. And a single definite denial of this kind is more decisive in such a controversy than a hundred passages in which Our Lord's Real Presence in His Supper is asserted; because these last consist as well with the spiritual, while the first is incompatible with the carnal presence of Christ. Such

[1] "We are really joined to our common divine principle, Jesus Christ Our Lord; and from Him we do communicate in all the blessings of His grace and the fruits of His passion."—*Taylor's Worthy Communicant*, i. 4. 2. It requires to be added, that Our Lord's Humanity, supernaturally present in the consecrated elements, is the medium through the reception of which we are united to Him in the Holy Eucharist. For there is this difference between Baptism and the Holy Eucharist (as is witnessed by the fact that consecration is essential to the validity of the one, but not of the other), that the office of the Holy Ghost in the former is to join men to Christ, but in the latter to bestow His Spiritual Presence.

are two quotations made by Bishop Poynet from St. Jerome and St. Augustin.[1] The celebrated letter of the latter to Dardanus has already been cited (p. 189).

This reference to the real manhood of Christ, as opposed to the conception that Sacraments produce their effect through any efficacy inherent in their elements, is warmly supported by our own Hooker: "For of Sacraments the very same is true, which Solomon's wisdom observeth in the brazen serpent—'He that turned towards it was not healed by the thing he saw, but by Thee, O Saviour of all.'"[2] That which we commonly discern in the course of nature is a certain orderly series, wherein like results follow habitually from like premises. Hence arises the instinctive belief, that in the construction of this material universe, the Author of our being works in constant reference to the laws which He has Himself ordained. Thus we say that food has a natural tendency to support life; not that we understand the secret mechanism by which it does so, but from observation of the facts, we discern that the

[1] "Of this victim, which is offered in a wonderful manner in commemoration of Christ, men may eat; but of that which Christ offered on the altar of the Cross in itself no man can eat" (*St. Hierom. in Poynet's Dialacticon*, p. 28). And again, St. Augustin says, "It seemed to them a hard saying, Except a man eat My flesh, he shall not have eternal life. They took it foolishly, they understood it carnally, and supposed that Our Lord was going to cut off some portion of His flesh and give it them. Therefore they said it is a hard saying. But if their hearts had not been hard, they would have said, This cannot be uttered without reason, there must be in it some secret mystery; they would have stayed with docility with Him, and have learned what was learnt by those who remained. For when His twelve Disciples had remained with Him after their departure, they suggested to Him, as though grieving at the fate of the others, that they were offended at His words, and were gone away. But He instructed them and said, it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken to you are Spirit and life. Understand spiritually what I have spoken. *This Body which you see, you are not to eat, nor to drink that blood, which shall be shed by those who shall crucify Me.* I have entrusted you with a certain mystery. Understood spiritually it will give you life. Its celebration indeed will be manifest to the senses, but its meaning will address itself to the inner mind."—*St. Aug. in Psalm.* 98.

[2] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 57, 4; vi. 6, 9.

Almighty Dispenser has been pleased to connect certain material agents with certain physical effects. This is what we mean by the course of nature. But we have no right to assume that material substances when once created are left to themselves, or that their action is the effect of their inherent principles. All that we can affirm is, that for material agents to produce material effects is the natural order of things. And on the same principle, that material agents should be attended by spiritual effects belongs to an order of things which must be supernatural. But why should any one assert that in this case the result is the effect of the agent itself, seeing that even in that class of subjects which are most strictly natural, no such assertion can be safely made? To affirm the truth of Christ's real presence, at all events, is not to attribute the efficacy of Sacraments to the effect produced by the elements which are employed, in themselves, but to trace it to the immediate and supernatural action of that glorified Humanity with which Sacraments bring us into connexion.

II. The other of the two questions which have been raised requires to be no less guarded than that which has been considered. We must remember not only what is *not* asserted respecting Sacraments, but what *is*. That there is in them some real influence and immediate power, results from the actual presence of that Divine Being, who in these sacred ordinances binds men by holy instruments to Himself. This is the very reason for asserting that the benefit of the Holy Communion does not result from the natural fruitfulness of the means employed, but from the actual presence of the Being, with whom those means unite us. Much less can we rest in the belief that these ordinances are merely a lesson addressed to the senses, or that the expressions used respecting them are only metaphorical. For they rest on a basis external to ourselves—they depend on that which has a real, tangible, objective existence, *i.e.*, Christ Our Lord, as He has been exalted into heaven, and by spiritual agency has become the Head of the redeemed race.

For when spiritual presence is spoken of, there are two notions which may suggest themselves. Such presence may either be supposed to result from the action of the mind, which receives an impression, or from the action of the being who produces it. The first would be a subjective and metaphorical, the second is an objective and real presence. We might think of a spectacle in Greece or Asia, and lay hold of it by internal impulse, as though it were present to our sight. But this would only be a figurative and visionary presence, because the movement would come altogether from within, and would be wholly irrespective of any action on the part of the object thought of. A real presence, on the contrary, is when there is some object external to ourselves, which produces upon us those effects which result from its propinquity (*vide* pp. 186-190). And such presence may be said to be spiritual as well as real, when the medium of communication, by which this external object affects, or is present with us, is not material contact, but spiritual efficacy. Our reason, therefore, for asserting that spiritual presence in Sacraments is a presence of the second and not of the first kind; that it is actual not metaphorical—real not visionary—is because it is the presence of Christ, and results from what is revealed as the result of His Incarnation. For though the two natures, which dwell in Him, retain the truth of their separate being, yet they so far concur in His actings towards mankind, that the inferior has received from the superior that property of having "life in itself," which renders it the source of life to others. And this life results from that spiritual presence of Our Lord's manhood, which has its medium of communication in the power of the Holy Ghost. When we speak, therefore, of spiritual presence in Sacraments, what we refer to is not the vivacity of our spirits, which are able to fancy what is not truly near, but that spiritual energy which was bestowed upon Christ's manhood, when it was Personally united to God. And therefore to disbelieve this spiritual presence, to resolve it into a figure of speech, to transfer

it to the action of our own minds, would be equivalent to the denial of Our Lord's real manhood; it would be to explain away His existence, and substitute a Sabellian fancy instead of the Catholic truth. And what would be the result, but that the life-giving principle of holiness must have its seat, not in Christ, but in our own minds; and therefore in effect that we should be our own Saviours? It may be asserted then respecting Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, that their efficacy results from that spiritual action by which Christ's manhood is truly present; that in both of them some real external gift is bestowed upon mankind. That such is the teaching of Scripture shall be shown by what is said respecting each of them, as well as by reference to their common character.

Baptism, then, is "a Sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life."[1] So that it is the especial purpose of Baptism, that from that perfect fountain of grace and holiness which is vouchsafed in the manhood of Christ Our Lord, the blessings of forgiveness and strength should be attained by every individual. Thus by conjunction with the purity of the second Adam, may be regained what was lost by the transmitted defilement of the first. How should this be sought for, but by union with Him from whom was derived the guiding principle which shone originally in man's breast? The image of God, in which man was made, and which was impaired by sin, has been shown to have resulted from that illuminating power of God the Word, which in fulness of time took up its personal dwelling in our flesh. What means are there then of recovering that which was lost, save by union with Him, in whom the light which was intended for

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 60, 2.

each man in his degree has its perfect inhabitation? We come to the fountain-head of light, that our extinguished lamps may each one be replenished.[1] The soul's regeneration, like the body's growth, is of course a protracted process, which the whole of life is not too long to complete. But what gives to Baptism its especial character is, that in that holy rite this process is begun. For then are men joined by heavenly agency to Christ, that the life of their souls may from that day forth have its development. Holy Scripture speaks everywhere of union with Christ, as that new creation in man's being, whereby the forfeited likeness of the Word is given back. For "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." And "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails nor uncircumcision, but the new creation." "In Christ, that is in His Communion or Church," says Olshausen, "the ancient divisions are unimportant; everything there depends on the new creation, upon that true regeneration, whereby Christ the New Man is born within us." Therefore St. Paul tells the Ephesians, "that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, and that ye put on the New Man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness."[2] To be created *after* God, is further explained to be the recovery of the impaired image of Christ: "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the New Man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."[3] This perfect recovery of Christ's image is stated to be the very purpose of God's dealings with men in His Church: "For whom He did foreknow, He also did pre-

[1] "As the first man Adam was made a living soul, so the last Adam was made a quickening spirit; a spirit of life to revive the relics of God's image in men's souls, and by the reviving of them to expel or blot out the expressions of Satan's image in them. All this He doth in part even in this life in such as fear and love Him. And in these two, to wit, in the reviving of God's image in us, and in the expunction and wiping out the stain of sin (which is no other than the image of Satan), doth our regeneration consist."—*Jackson's Works*, xi. 21, 10.

[2] Eph. iv. 22, 24.

[3] Col. iii. 9, 10.

destinate to be conformed to the image of His Son."[1] And "we are all changed into the same image."[2]

But how is this restoration to be effected? How can God's image be created anew in the soul? If man had never fallen, it had been sufficient to inherit it: fallen as he is, there must be the gift of a new life.[3] And this new life had its commencement in the fact of the Incarnation. For by it was a beginning made in the person of Him who was to be "the first-born among many brethren." Then did Divine gifts take up their abode in humanity, that from the Head they might be distributed to all His brethren. For in the new as in the old creation is He "the first-born of every creature," "the beginning of the creation of God."[4] All its subsequent ramifications are but the result of the impulse which in His Incarnation was bestowed. For, "He is the Head even Christ, from whom the whole Body fitly joined together maketh increase to the edifying of itself in love." Whereof, that men "might be made partakers of the divine nature," is the wonderful result. This work, therefore, follows from union with Him, in whom originated[5] the new creation of God. It began with the Head, it extends itself to His members; it began with the new Adam, it reaches on to all His brethren. Thus is He in truth "made a quickening spirit." Thus are we all "complete in Him."[6] To suppose, then, that such a work could commence from a spontaneous,

[1] Romans viii. 29. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

[3] "That every thing in the process of salvation depends ultimately on God's operation, which man on his part can only in faith receive, depends on the very nature of the process of regeneration. It is like a new creation; the regenerate are God's making, created in Christ Jesus."—*Olshausen on Ephesians* ii. 10.

[4] So far as such terms refer to our Lord's Godhead, they do not relate to priority of time, as though He were a created being, but they set forth the truth that He was Himself the type and pattern of the beings which He created. And so too when His human nature is spoken of as the beginning of the new creation, the order of causation, rather than the order of time, is the condition contemplated.

[5] "Originem quam sumsit in utero Virginis posuit in fonte baptismatis; dedit aquæ, quod dedit matri," &c.—*S. Leo. Serm.* xxiv. 4.

[6] Col. ii. 10.

inherent action, would be the very heresy of Pelagius. The flame requires to be kindled from without, that it may burn within. There must be an external action to which the inward movement must respond. Renovation must have its root in Regeneration. There must be a gift antecedent to our efforts. This gift is that first union with Christ, whereon all communication of graces from Him to us depends. Out of this beginning arises the whole system of the Christian life. And this heavenly impulse is expressly declared in Scripture to be extended to us in Baptism: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ," says St. Paul, "have put on Christ."[1] For "by one spirit are we all baptized into one Body."[2] And in Baptism, as the Apostle asserts twice over, that death to the old nature takes place, whereby the new creation in Christ is commenced. "We are buried with Him by Baptism into death,"[3] "wherein also ye are risen with Him."[4] So that St. Peter says,[5] that "Baptism doth also now save us."[6] For Our Lord Himself had taught that in this ordinance lies the beginning of the spiritual life—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:"—a passage whereof Hooker reminds us, "that of all the ancient, there is not one to be named, that ever did otherwise either expound or allege the place than as implying external Baptism."[7]

Since the statements of Scripture on this subject are so precise, how comes it then that any persons should have dissented from this universal opinion of our Lord's first disciples? The grounds of men's objection appear to be two: First, an attachment to the idea introduced, or at least systematized by Calvin, that grace is not given to any except those who will

[1] Gal. iii. 27. [2] 1 Cor. xii. 13.
[3] Romans vi. 4. [4] Col. ii. 12. [5] 1 Peter iii. 21.
[6] It is not of course, says Dr. Jackson, "the virtue or efficacy of the consecrated water in which we were washed, but the virtue of His blood, which was once shed for us, and which by baptism is sprinkled upon us, or communicated unto us, which immediately cleanseth us from all our sins."—*Works*, x. 55, 8. [7] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 59, 3.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

finally be saved; and secondly, the assertion that no visible results attend on Baptism. The difficulties which these considerations involve induce men to refer to such passages[1] of Scripture as express the full effect and ultimate consequence of regeneration, *i.e.*, victory over sin, and final perseverance: and they infer that no gift has really been bestowed in Baptism, unless these ultimate consequences are discerned to be its effect. They deny in effect that any seed has been sown, where fruit is not brought forth. They deny that there can be dead branches in the Christian vine. And the language in which Scripture and the Church speak of something as actually *done* in Baptism, they consider to be merely a charitable hope that something will be done hereafter—a hope which, in the majority of instances, they say is not borne out by the result. Now, the passages of Scripture which they cite have in themselves no tendency to show that in Baptism occurs no real work: for they only speak of this work as one, the completion whereof is the extinction of sin; and which must therefore spread itself through man's whole life. But all that is asserted of Baptism is that since it is our first means of union with the manhood of Christ, the basis of our spiritual growth must be laid in it. "Baptism doth challenge to itself but the inchoation of those graces, the consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing."[2] The denial therefore that in Baptism, as rightly and worthily participated, there is any real change made in the recipient of the ordinance — the assertion that the benefits ascribed to it are merely figurative, contingent, occasional—that they are spoken of prospectively as something to be hereafter attained, and not positively as something actually possessed—all this does not follow from any scriptural authority; the grounds for supposing it are men's antecedent difficulties. And as to the first of them, it is surely matter of surprise, that any traditional attachment to the opinions of Calvin should interfere with the direct assurances of God's Word. For it has been shown by

[1] 1 John iii. 9; v. 18.

[2] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 57, 6.

Bishop Butler that the predestinarian theory is never carried out so rigidly as to preclude all the practical inferences to which it is intellectually opposed. This is far from being undesirable, considering how imperfect an instrument is man's understanding, and how much safer in many cases is the appeal to conscience than to argument. But those who can reconcile the doctrine of arbitrary decrees with the general invitations of Scripture to repentance and faith, need not object surely to allow that the gifts of grace may be co-extensive with the ordinances of the Gospel. For do not faith and repentance need grace as an unavoidable pre-requisite? Why, then, should men deny the reality of Baptism, even if on their theory it be "a seal perhaps to the grace of election before received," seeing it is declared to be "to our sanctification here a step that hath not any before it?" [1]

Neither is there reason why men should ground their disbelief in the reality of Baptism on the small results which they see it effect. The very principle of faith is to admit that which sense does not discern: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." And it is hard to say how much of the inefficacy of Baptism is due to the popular unbelief which prevents men from doing justice to it. When children are not instructed in the nature of the gift which they have received, we cannot wonder if it be allowed to be inoperative. Its result might be very different if they were accustomed to expect those effects which St. Cyprian assures us resulted from his own baptism. He speaks of his former difficulties; and how powerless he felt to escape those evil habits which adhered to his nature. "But," he says, "after that the stain of former sins being washed away through the water of the new birth, a light from above infused itself into my acquitted and purified bosom; and after that, through a spirit drawn from above, a new birth had made me a new man—what was doubtful began immediately in a wonderful manner to receive confirmation; what was shut to be opened;

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 60, 3.

what was dark to be enlightened; what was impossible to be attainable."[1] But with this disbelief in the reality of Baptism is joined an unreasonable estimate of the results, which, if real, it might be expected to effect. For the gifts of grace do not in any case supersede the responsibility of mankind. Those who think most highly of Baptism regard it only as the appointed means for that union with Christ whereby men may obtain strength to serve Him. Baptism neither exempts devout men from the necessity of a watchful life, nor careless men from the necessity of conversion. It is a reason why the watchfulness of the one should be more unvaried, and the conversion of the other more complete. To receive gifts of grace is in itself no security against losing them. In Adam himself, the image of God did not preclude the possibility of disobedience. Much less can this be expected in his descendants, on whom the concupiscence of the will has been entailed by his failure. It is sometimes forgotten that Baptism does not determine what *shall be* men's future state, but what *is* their present position. And herein lies the defect of all hypothetical interpretations of the language used respecting this holy ordinance. For their purpose is to transform that which is essentially an assertion respecting a present fact into a supposition about the future. It is asserted, for example, respecting every child who is received into the Church after private Baptism, "that this child *is by Baptism regenerate*." As in such cases no sponsors have been employed, the validity of the ordinance cannot be attributable, as has sometimes been imagined, to their faith. The Church, of course, supposes it to result from that reality of union with Christ's[2] manhood, whereby those who were heirs of Adam's sinfulness become heirs of grace. But what signification is assigned to the words, by those who deny that Baptism is the appointed

[1] *Ep. ad Donatum, statim a Baptismo conscripta*, Ed. Rigalt. p. 2.

[2] "Take the case of any child: if it is one with Christ already, why is it baptized? But if (as really happens) it is baptized that it may be one with Christ, therefore until baptized it was not one with Christ."—*S. Aug. De Pecc. Mer.* i. 28.

channel of grace? Some children, say the parties in question, are no doubt regenerated at Baptism; it may be so in any individual instance, and it is charitable to affirm that which it is impossible to deny. And this, they observe, is the course adopted by the Church respecting the departed, concerning whose future condition, because unable to predict it, we express a charitable hope. But to confound conjecture with assertion, is to destroy the whole meaning of speech. Things future, being from their nature uncertain to us, do not admit of a positive affirmation. And in the case of such present things as we feel to be dubious, we cannot do more than express a hope, leaving it to the result to clear up what is uncertain. Since hope, then, is in its nature conversant with things which are future or contingent, its expression is compatible with the highest degree of uncertainty. In the most unpromising morning we may hope that the sun will shine at noon. And respecting the departed, supposing them to die in the Church's communion, we can hardly do less than declare them our brethren, and express hope that they sleep in Jesus. And this, with thanks for their deliverance from this world's miseries, is all that is expressed by our service. What countenance is there here for the positive assertion of a present fact, concerning which we have no knowledge? It is obvious what would be said respecting a man who asserted unequivocally that the sun was shining at present, and who afterwards justified himself on the ground that he hoped it was, but possessed no means of informing himself. And what else can be thought of those who assert respecting every baptized child, that "this child *is* regenerate," when they believe in their consciences that in all probability it is not?

But to leave the Church's language, and come to the positive effect of this system. It rests plainly on the notion that the benefits of Baptism do not depend upon the present act, but on the future results which attend a devotion to God's service. These no doubt are many and great. They associate the party with Christians—they suggest such feelings as should attend

an early dedication to God, and thus lead to those efforts on the part of man which God's grace will doubtless meet with a proportionable blessing. But in all this there is one radical defect—the need of some predisposing grace on the part of God, whereby the first movement may be made towards holiness. For this the Church refers us to Baptism. It considers this first gift of life to be derived from that union with Christ, which He originally bestows. What was said to the disciples, not excluding the one on whom the gift was conferred ineffectually, is in Baptism uttered to all Christians: "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you." The enslaved will of man was first restored to its perfect freedom in the great representative of our race, in whom that tendency to concupiscence, which Adam entailed upon his descendants, was counteracted by the full influx of God's spirit. The first of Adam's progeny who possessed that perfect liberty in which our original parent was created was the second Adam Jesus Christ. Now, it is only through union with our disenthralled representative that we also can escape bondage. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Unless the beginnings of the spiritual life are laid in this antecedent gift of union with Christ, we pass over of necessity to the Rationalistic principle, which would attribute them to that natural relation of the soul to God which it had by creation. A new birth, then, is needed as preliminary to the first actings of the will, because upon it depends our admission into "the glorious liberty of the children of God." And, therefore, *re*generation does not merely imply the second birth of every individual, as opposed to his primary birth by nature (though this doubtless is referred to); but it also points to that state of freedom in which man was originally created, but into which every heir of Adam's sin requires to be *re*admitted. This birth *back again* into the condition in which man was made when he was fashioned after God's likeness, is not complete till his will has laid full hold on that freedom into which he was admitted by God's grace. Therefore, the complete

and general development of the Christian Covenant is described by Our Lord as "the Regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of His glory." For then shall the ancient state be again perfectly possessed by those who "being made free from sin" have become "servants of righteousness." But the beginning of this work in every individual must be through God's act, and not through the act of man, because its very object is to give man the power of acting, by the enfranchisement of the will from its hereditary bondage. And the act whereby God bestows this blessing is especially connected by St. Paul with that Sacrament of Baptism, which Our Lord Himself appointed: "According to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." But such a preliminary act on the part of God is negatived, when the real, objective influence of Baptism is denied, and it is asserted not to be the appointed channel of grace. Hereby everything is thrown on man's part; and thus the Pelagian [1] doctrine is in reality introduced, and man's salvation is made to depend originally upon his own exertions. This is not the meaning of many who deny that a new birth is conferred in Baptism; their intention is to refer regeneration to the immediate act of God, and they exhort the young to ask and desire it. But on what are prayers and good desires to be built? To say that it is on natural goodness, were Pelagianism. Yet if we are referred to God's grace, by what event except Baptism [2] are

[1] "Every mother hastening piously up with her infant son says, 'Let it be baptized, that it may be saved.' Pelagius objects, 'How should it be saved? There is nothing in it which needs salvation.'"—*S. Aug. Serm.* clxxxiii. 8. St. Augustin points out that the real tendency of this system is to represent Infant Baptism as unnecessary. "Dic mihi obsecro te, Parvulis baptizatis Christus aliquid, an nihil prodest? Necesse est dicat prodesse; premitur mole matris Ecclesiæ. Forte quidem vellent hoc dicere; nam ratiocinationes eorum ad hoc videntur compellere; sed auctoritate reprimuntur Ecclesiæ."—*Serm.* ccxciv. 17.

[2] "Quod" (*i.e.* illuminari) "per sacramentum baptismatis in parvulis fieri non dubitat mater Ecclesia, quæ cor et os maternum eis præstat, ut sacris mysteriis imbuantur, quia nondum possunt corde proprio credere ad justitiam, nec ore proprio confiteri ad salutem."—*S. Aug. de Pecc. Mer.* i. 25.

those who are born in sin entitled to it, previously to the first actings of their understanding? What we are speaking of is the case of those who have not yet been able, by any act of their own, to take part in that which is necessary to their will's freedom. Yet what Christian parent but would associate prayers to God with the very first lispings of infant speech?[1] Either men must be prepared, then, to adopt the Pelagian hypothesis, or their conduct to the young *assumes* the presence of that very gift which Baptism has been appointed to convey. And the only alternative is such rigid adherence to the Calvinistic theory as, by declaring Christian education needless and impossible, would go counter to the instincts of nature and the Word of God.

But it may be objected, are not the Heathen exhorted to prayer as a preliminary to Baptism? They doubtless are; and in their case the appeal rests upon that universal presence of the Word, by which every man is in a measure enlightened. Unless there were some remnant of that original influence, which the Word exercised over His creatures, no basis would exist for their first conversion [*vide* pp. 90–92]. But their prayers and efforts are not built upon that union with Christ, which is the principle assumed in Christian education. To deal with Christians as heathen men should be dealt with is to shut our eyes to the freedom and fulness of the Gospel: it is to treat the "joint-heirs with Christ" as though they were bondmen. The principle of Christian education is avowed in the Church Catechism, wherein every child is taught to declare at the outset that in Baptism it was made "a member of Christ." And after praying for them that they "may ever *remain* in the number of" God's "elect children," we teach every child to affirm that the Holy Ghost "sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of

[1] "The freedom of the will, which suffered detriment in the first man," say the Fathers at Orange, in their decrees against semi-Pelagianism, "cannot be repaired, except by the grace of Baptism; what was lost cannot be restored, except by Him who was able to bestow it."—*Harduin*, ii. 1099.

God." This principle is consistently carried out by the Church, for she limits the use of Christian burial to those children whose bodies have been consecrated in Baptism by union with the Body of Christ. And even those who have not the advantage of her guidance proceed usually upon an analogous system. For their plan of education is professedly built on the plan of the Gospel, and on the expected succour of the Comforter. And yet how are men entitled to His help, save by virtue of the Mediation of Christ? And what right have we to Christ's Mediation, unless we have been brought into the same relation to the new man into which our birth brings us to the old one? It were contrary to the whole theory of the Gospel to assume the existence in man of Christian graces antecedently to their participating in the Mediation of Christ. And yet that Christian principles are to be acted upon is the very foundation of the Gospel scheme, seeing that it begins by assuming a belief, the practical effect whereof is afterwards to be developed. The existence, therefore, of an external and objective mean, whereby we may in the first instance be united to Christ, is the very basis of subsequent obedience. And this is why its denial is more plainly inconsistent with our Ritual and Catechism, than with the Articles, in which doctrines are abstractedly exhibited. For the evil to which it leads is a practical denial of the Gospel —an undervaluing of that union with Christ Our Lord which is consequent upon His Incarnation—an over-estimate of human efforts—and such a tendency will conflict more plainly with those parts of our established formularies, in which our dependence upon Christ Our Lord and our constant adherence to Him are actually exhibited.

In respect to the Lord's Supper, it may be doubted whether the same amount of belief is entertained on all hands as in Hooker's days was universally prevalent. "It is on all sides," he says, "plainly confessed, first, that this Sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire Person, *as a mystical head* unto

every soul that receiveth Him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a *mystical member* of Him; and secondly, that to whom the *Person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them He giveth by the same Sacrament His Holy Spirit to sanctify them, as it sanctifieth Him which is their Head."[1] In these words the union with Christ's manhood by mystical participation is put forth as the leading characteristic of this holy ordinance. But since the time of Hoadley a different system has become prevalent. The mere human side of this Sacrament has been mainly thought of: it has been considered to be a sermon preached to the senses —an act whereby we commemorate the death of Christ, and testify our reverence for his memory. This account of its uses, to the exclusion of that deeper view, which is founded on the application of Our Lord's Incarnation to the wants of men, and on the necessity of external grace, having been introduced by Socinian writers, has since found advocates in the Church. As Baptism is explained away into the mere expression of a charitable expectation, so the Lord's Supper into a simple commemoration. How are we to decide whether this holy service is to be considered a divine rite or a human ordinance; whether it is the supernatural means by which whole Christ gives Himself to His people, or a mere accommodation to the taste for acted services! The letter of Scripture surely represents the eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood to be a mystical means of obtaining heavenly benefits. But those who question the apparent meaning of such passages of Scripture, deny that the sixth chapter of St. John can refer to an ordinance which was instituted after the narrative which it records. It is not here affirmed that the spiritual communion of His members with Our Lord's manhood is confined to that holy feast, which is the signal and peculiar means of maintaining it; but if the participation of Christ in His Holy Supper be not at all referred to in the sixth chapter of St. John, then it is hard

[1] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 67, 7.

to see how Holy Scripture could be intended for the instruction of ordinary readers. For surely no simple persons, whose minds were not pre-occupied by some theory, could ever read that chapter without the most palpable misconception. And how could St. John have delivered it to the Church, when the Holy Communion had been habitually celebrated for half a century, without taking care to guard it from such obvious misapprehension? But, in fact, that this dialogue should have been prophetic of what was to come is so far from an objection, that it is in exact consistency with other parts of Our Lord's instruction. How much did it contain which even "His disciples understood not at the first?" He spoke of being "lifted up from the earth"—He promised "living water"—He declared the necessity of taking up the Cross and following Him: in all these cases His prophetic words received their interpretation from the event.[1] And the sixth chapter of St. John contains a direct assurance that its meaning would not be apparent till Our Lord's Ascension. "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" So that we have express authority for interpreting it by events which were to come. Hooker accordingly points out to us how exactly what the Apostles had "learned before—that Christ's flesh and blood are the true cause of eternal life"[2]—was explained by Our Lord's institution of the Holy Communion. And as this is the natural conclusion which would be adopted by untaught readers

[1] It is the especial characteristic of St. John's Gospel, that with a pious care it gathers up those remaining fragments of Divine teaching which inspired Meditation revealed to be the most real and pregnant secrets of that Gospel Kingdom, the mysterious treasures whereof he had longer time upon earth than his fellows to survey. Take, for instance, the repeated declarations that He who came in "fashion as a man," because the Personal Word of God, was the "true light" of man's nature—a fact which Our Lord's hearers can hardly have understood at the time, but which opens to us the secret things of His kingdom in a manner which adds wonderfully to the view supplied by the other Evangelists. For it connects itself with that whole system of truths respecting the Incarnate Word, which is the peculiar revelation of the Theological Gospel. *Vide* St. John i. 4, 5, 9; iii. 19; viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 35, 36, 46.

[2] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 67, 4.

of Scripture, so is it supported by the unanimous testimony of early writers. "Both the Greek and Latin Fathers," says Bishop Poynet, "refer the words of Our Lord in the sixth chapter of St. John with great unanimity to the Sacrament of the Eucharist." [1] Our Church sanctions the same interpretation in her Ritual—"then we eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us." As Dr. Jackson expresses it, "This present efficacy of Christ's body and blood upon our souls, or real communication of both, I find as a truth unquestionable amongst the ancient Fathers, and as a Catholic confession. They all agree that we are immediately cleansed and purified from our sins by the blood of Christ; that His human nature, by the inhabitation of the Deity, is made to us the inexhaustible fountain of life." [2]

One further argument for the reality of that union with the body of Christ which is bestowed in the Holy Eucharist, is supplied by the circumstances under which its observance was commenced. On Our Lord's Ascension, His Disciples returned to Jerusalem to wait for that gift of the Holy Ghost which was shortly to be dispensed. It had been declared to be the work of the Blessed Comforter to provide some new and closer means of union with that manhood of the Son which was to be withdrawn from mortal sense. By this means He who in appearance departed was in reality to be brought more near. The new Head of the renewed race, the second Adam of reformed humanity, was about to provide that principle of supernatural union whereby all His members were to be engrafted into Himself. Now, it is through the Holy Communion that this connexion is especially maintained. Its great purpose is to bring the members of Christ into mystic union with their Head. Thereby does the manhood of Christ act upon His brethren. In this circumstance surely we have the reason why, during that first assemblage at Jerusalem, no mention is made of an observ-

[1] *Dialecticon*, p. 9. By J. Poynet, Bishop of Winchester, and Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer.

[2] Works, Book x. 55, 12.

ance, which so soon as the Holy Ghost had bestowed the fulness of His gifts, became the main act of Christian worship. "These all continued in one accord with prayer and supplication." But no sooner had the life-giving medium been bestowed, than "they continued in *breaking of bread,* and in prayer." The Holy Communion, it seems, could not have effect till the pouring out of that quickening Spirit [1] by which the members of Christ mystical are attached to their head. "The one Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints did not begin to be *in esse* or bear true fruit until the effusion of the Holy Ghost, which is the soul of the one Holy Catholic Church, or of the mystical body of Christ." [2] But how different had it been if the Communion of Saints were only a figurative expression, and the Holy Communion a mere commemoration! When were the Disciples more united by natural bonds than in this hour of their desertion? When were they more likely to commemorate their Lord, than while His departure was so fresh? The Holy Eucharist cannot, therefore, have been a merely human rite; its force was not that it addressed their senses, and set forth what they had lost; it depended for its efficacy on that new gift of the Holy Ghost, whereby Christ their Head came back to them with power; it was their perpetual means of union with His glorified humanity, their souls' food, the medium of the body's immortality.

It remains only to recall that which has been already stated as applicable to both the sacred ordinances which have been con-

[1] It may be alleged that the two disciples at Emmaus were admitted to the full participation of that Eucharistic presence which is here affirmed to have been consequent upon the gift of the Holy Ghost. But whatever it was to which they were admitted, the case is plainly an excepted one, since it was the act of Him in whom the same gift dwelt personally which was about to possess a new medium of presence through the power of the Holy Ghost. Before Our Lord's death, He told His Disciples that the same presence had already been bestowed through the Incarnation of the Word, which was afterwards to be maintained through the Advent of the Comforter. "He dwelleth *with* you, and *shall be* in you."

[2] Jackson's Works, ix. 41, 3.

sidered. The reality of both of them has been maintained: it has been affirmed that Baptism is not merely the expression of a charitable hope; that the Lord's Supper is not a bare act of pious recollection. The essential principle of each of them has been shown to be union with the perfect manhood of Christ Our Lord. Let it be remembered only in conclusion, that to deny their reality is to assail the great principle of the Mediation of Christ. For the Doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation does not rest only on the Divine power of Christ, as a partaker in the nature of self-existent Godhead; it implies also that, by associating man's nature to His own, He has made created substance the channel of His gifts. Now, as the media through which these gifts are dispensed to His brethren; as the ramifications, whereby His Divine nature distributes itself on the right hand and the left, these two Sacraments go together—their importance is equal—their effect alike—and to disparage them is to derogate from that principle of action which the wisdom of God has seen fitting to adopt. Every attempt to explain them away, every contrivance for extenuating the real import of what they effect, is a virtual detracting from the reality of that objective and actual influence, which Christ the Mediator is pleased to exert. Its tendency is to resolve His actions into a metaphor, and His existence into a figure of speech. His specific and personal agency as the Eternal Son, who in the fulness of time conjoined Himself to man's nature for the recovery of a fallen race, is merged in the general action of that ultimate Spirit, whom none but Atheists professedly reject. For the real objection against the Sacramental system does not arise from any deficiency in its Scriptural authority, which has been shown to be ample, but from the abstract improbability that external ordinances can be the means of obtaining internal gifts. Now, this improbability rests on the circumstance that the *natural* means of connexion with God is the intercourse of mind with mind, and consequently that the intercourse through Sacraments is *supernatural*. The connexion with God, *i.e.* which man received by creation, and

which Rationalism affirms to be sufficient for his wants, is more compatible with men's natural position, than that new system of Mediation which has been revealed in the Gospel. But let the Doctrine of Mediation be admitted, and it ceases to be an argument against the Sacramental system that it does not accord with that scheme of nature, which the Gospel professes to supersede. And the Rationalistic argument against these means of grace, is of equal avail against that whole scheme of Mediation upon which they are dependent. If the natural intercourse of mind with the Unembodied Mind of the Creator supersedes the necessity of Sacramental ordinances, does it not supersede equally the humanity of Christ? If man has still that immediate communion with God of which Scripture affirms that the Fall deprived him, what need is there of a Mediator between them? Thus does the objection mount up from earth to heaven—from Christ feeding men below through Sacraments, to Christ mediating above by His Atonement and Intercession. For "if we have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if we tell you of heavenly things?" If the Sacraments be thus emptied of their meaning, it is because the present actings of Christ as the Son of Man are not appreciated; and the purposes of His Incarnation are forgotten. And this forgetfulness again may be traced to unbelief in that real diversity of Persons in the Blessed Trinity, in which all creaturely existence has its ultimate root. Thus does a practical Sabellianism respecting Christ's Person coincide with that Rationalistic theory, by which the reality of His Sacraments is disputed. And their surrender is fatal to the true doctrine concerning Himself, even as the true doctrine of His nature sets the importance of these instruments in a proper light.

CHAPTER XIV.

CHRIST AS MEDIATOR THE SOURCE OF HOLINESS AND KNOWLEDGE TO MANKIND.

We have now surveyed two stages in the wonderful economy of man's salvation. The first was that God became man: the second, that the God-man became one with His brethren. The first was the union of two widely different natures by personal alliance; the second, the union of many brethren with their con-natural head by Sacramental grace "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"—here is the first; and the second is—"Christ in us the hope of glory." It remains only to notice some consequences entailed on mankind at large by this great event. Its full effects would be too wide to speak of, and they blend themselves with that subjective part of religion on which it is not designed to enter in this place. For what is meant by all personal and individual religion, but that men receive, lay hold of, and rest upon that Mediation of Christ which has been set forth as the central truth of the Gospel—as an actual object external to our souls? Here then nothing further can be done than to touch upon that common influence of this fact upon mankind at large, which may in some sort be regarded also as an objective and external truth; since, like Mediation itself, it assumes a collective character, and reacts, as an outward mean of efficacy, upon individual minds.

Looking then at the effect of Christ's Mediation on mankind at large, it may be affirmed to be the producing principle of holiness and of knowledge. These blessings might be bestowed upon men by individual gift, as Abraham was called by peculiar summons to be Father of the Faithful, or St. Paul to be the Apostle of the Gentiles; or they might come like the Apostleship of St. Matthias, or the royalty of Solomon, through the instru-

mentality of others. Now the second of these is the mode which is adopted respecting the gifts of the Gospel. They come from the Head[1] to the members: they are procured by Christ Our Lord for His earthly brethren; they are the privileges which He purchased through the infinite desert of His perfect obedience. We have no original right in them; but by virtue of our being engrafted into the Body of Christ, we participate in them from Him. And since it is by aggregation to the body of the faithful that we become members of Christ, therefore our personal blessedness is the result of that family union which gives us a share in its collective rights. "If children, then heirs: heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." Thus do Gospel blessings proceed from that which is general to that which is particular: first in the series is Christ the Mediator—then that family of mankind whom He associates to Himself—and lastly, each individual claimant of those infinite privileges, which having been purchased by our representative on behalf of manhood at large, have become the right of its meanest participators. The three stages in this wonderful process are summed up in those mysterious words wherein the Mediator, as the Head of mankind, addressed Himself to the Almighty: "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." God's presence in Christ is the beginning of our regeneration: the union of all believers in the one Body of Christ is its second stage: the third is that influence of the Word on every individual heart which is bestowed through the public ordinances of the Gospel. This process is not set down, of course, according to the order of time, but according to the order of causation. God calls individuals to enter His Church before they are members of it; but when they are thus called, His gifts proceed downward from that which is collective to that which is individual: "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee."

And here, therefore, we have an example, how "the earnest

[1] "Illuminatio quippe nostra participatio Verbi est, illius scilicet vitæ, quæ lux est hominum."—*S. Aug. De Trin.* iv. 4.

expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." For what is this but the fulfilment of those darling expectations of man's heart which were noticed at the beginning of this inquiry? What has man been reaching after, ever since his history commenced, but such a regeneration? He has looked for it on the side of this world and on the side of the next—in politics and in religion—in the social reconstruction of civil communities, and in the formation of societies affecting the divine life; and if he has failed to find it, the ground of his disappointment has not been the want of earnestness or of intelligence, but because from God only can descend power to renew the earth. He only who made the world is able to restore it. Yet these successive attempts witness man's conviction that collective must ever be the basis of individual improvement—that as each man owes the gift of speech, the fruits of experience, the softening influences of civilization, and all the other lights of this world, to the race of which he is a co-heir—so the higher blessings of a perfect existence are not to be acquired by individuals through their single strength, but are God's gift to His chosen family throughout the earth.

1. Those who reject revelation have often anticipated such results from the mere development of civil society. Its growth and advancement promise, as they say, such unlimited improvements, that its prospective state may be regarded as that blissful condition of mankind which has been anticipated by prophets and recorded by chroniclers. Here, they allege, is the Millennium of the one and the Golden Age of the other. And from this reformed and exalted society there will flow to individuals every blessing which their heart desires. Thus does Strauss maintain that "the union of the divine and human nature has its completion in the collective race of mankind." "This," he says, "is the key of the whole Christian system; and as the subject of all its assertions we must take not an individual, *i.e.*, Christ, but an idea—a realized and actual idea."[1] "This idea is humanity viewed col-

[1] Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, sec. 149, vol. ii. p. 767.

lectively: humanity is the union of two natures—it is God incarnate."[1] "The history of man," says a writer of our own, "is truly the word of God."[2] This is but a more strong expression of that error which lies at the root of every system, in which the regeneration of mankind is expected from mere social attempts. For since God only can effect man's regeneration, to look for it from human efforts is to suppose that in man himself lies the principle of Deity. Such an opinion is closely allied to the characteristic feature of Rationalism, the substitution namely of that relation to God which we have by creation and nature, in place of that which is given to us through Mediation and Grace. Thus are men looked upon as able to hold intercourse with God through the mere communing of mind with mind; and the Sacramental system, whereby the Mediator associates man to himself, is alleged to be a needless interruption. But with what success has the system of Rationalism been tried? Has not one experiment miscarried after another? Are not social renovations of mankind invariably defeated by the corruption of man's heart? A defective, disappointing, uncertain condition is proved to be the necessary state of every society, which is made up of those who are heirs to Adam's sin. There is a barrier between them and perfection which cannot be displaced: and "though they toss themselves, yet can they not prevail; though they roar, yet can they not pass over it." For man natural cannot get beyond that head and type of his nature in whom were summed up its virtues and defects. In all forms of thought and action, under every condition and sky, he is still but the old Adam, and bears the burthen of his parent's deficiencies and faults. And how then shall he go beyond the normal representative of his race? He was born in Adam's image—how shall he escape it? How shall he rise to a higher nature than that in which he was begotten? Every race of animals

[1] On the other hand, says St. Austin: "Deus naturâ non sumus; homines naturâ sumus." "Deus itaque factus homo justus, intercessit Deo pro homine peccatore."—*De Trin.* iv. 4.

[2] Martineau's *Eastern Life*, iii. 72.

admits of improvement within its natural limits, but the limits of the race may not be overleaped. Adam must still reproduce himself in those who are born his children. Only by the intervention of some new nature could there be an exaltation of the old one. And therefore all attempts at a social regeneration of mankind have but witnessed to man's wants, but not redressed them.

2. There seems more reason in the expectation, that the religious associations of men might effect the improvement of their race. For this is a testimony to the conviction, to which false as well as true systems of religion witness, that from God alone must come man's recovery. Hence the consecration of a peculiar class of men to the especial service of God, that thereby they might exercise a purifying and hallowing influence on their worldly brethren. This system, which prevailed among most heathen nations, found its true expression in that favoured family which was selected by God Himself to be to Him "a kingdom of Priests and an holy nation." But favoured as the Jewish people really were, they over-rated their privilege, and over-estimated what it was given them to effect. Their grand object was to witness to Him who was to come, and to keep up the memory of His approach. But they supposed the object of their calling to be those services which themselves should render in the earth: and Isaiah's predictions respecting Gospel times, they interpreted of the future glories of their own nation. Herein they did but fall into the error by which many Christians are still possessed, who, in opposition to St. Paul's words, interpret the predicted supremacy of Israel of some future exaltation of the carnal seed of Abraham, and not of that true Israel of the new election—the members of Christ. Such a notion, prevalent in ancient as well as recent times, led the Jews to apply the prophecies of the Old Testament to their collective nation, and not to Christ.[1] This error is men-

[1] Perhaps some countenance for the notion has been derived, however unreasonably, from the Book of Ecclesiasticus. Compare, for example, Ecclesiasticus, chap. xxiv., with Proverbs, chap. viii. Wisdom, which in the Book of Proverbs is a *Personal* attribute of Deity, is set forth in

tioned by Origen: the prophecies of Isaiah, a learned Jew assured him, "did not refer to one individual, but to the whole people."[1] The fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah was interpreted to mean, that "Israel was not punished for its own offences, but for the faults of the rest of the world, and that the sins of all other nations were laid upon it."[2] And the benefit which this much-enduring people was expected to effect, was, that at some future day "Monotheism should by its means gain a glorious victory over the Heathen, and the knowledge of the one God should be spread abroad by Israel and its inspired prophets."[3] Thus did a work, which the nation at large was to effect, absorb every thought. Israel was to achieve a regeneration in the popular religions of the earth.[4] Thus did they forget the Great Head and Representative of Mankind, to whom it was the true honour of Israel to minister. They looked to the influence of their own tribes for a result which was to follow only when that Shiloh came, to whom should be the gathering of the nations. All instruments were in truth to be gathered together in Him; His people's honour was but to be a part of Him: the privilege of Israel was that of it, according to the flesh, "Christ came who is over all, God blessed for ever."

And herein also lay the distinction of that race of Prophets to whom some later sceptics[5] would apply those declarations

Ecclesiasticus as embodied in His chosen people: "Let thy dwelling be in Jacob, and thine inheritance in Israel;" "I took root in an honourable people, even in the portion of the Lord's inheritance." And we look vainly for the *personal* manifestation of the Word, when it is said of wisdom, "The first man knew her not perfectly; *no more shall the last find her out*" (8, 12, 28). Susceptible as this beautiful Chapter is of a sound interpretation, it may yet have been associated in the minds of Jews with their popular error.

[1] *Orig. cont. Celsum.* 1, in Gesen. on Isaiah, vol. iii. 165.

[2] Vide Kimchi and Jarchi, as cited by Gesenius iii. 166.

[3] Gesenius iii. p. 164.

[4] To this expectation, though prepared, of course, to rest it on its proper basis, St. Peter probably referred, when he exhorted the Jews to repent, in hope that the anticipated glories of their nation might be realized, and "that the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord."—*Acts* iii. 19.

[5] Isaiah, according to Gesenius, speaks in the name of that class of men

which the carnal Israelites interpreted of their nation. For the office of Prophets, like that of Priests, derives its importance from the influence of that real Mediator who formerly as now was present with and for His people through the intervention of His earthly ministers. And it was as shadows of Him, and as united to Him, that all the Prophets "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported." Thus was grace to descend from the Mediator upon the collective race. In Him alone were "all families of the earth" to be blessed. The fulfilment of the ancient promise to Abraham was reserved for Him. Whatever renovation was expected for society at large was not to be attained through the religious influence of any priestly caste, any more than through the natural influence of any civil institutions. In Him and through Him only could it arise, in whom God and man were united; who succoured our race by the infusion of a new and higher principle; who was the "one Mediator" to bring down to us a divine life, and thereby to revivify the putrid mass of corrupted mortality.

to whom he belonged, and the commentator alleges it as a striking indication of the truth of his interpretation, that the Hebrew word which expresses the persecuted object in the important passage, "for the transgression of my people was *he* stricken," is neither singular nor plural, but a poetical form, employed usually to express some collective object. He would translate the passage, therefore, "for the transgression of my people was the stroke upon *them*" *i.e.*, the prophets. "The word לָמוֹ for לָהֶם I prefer," he says, "to the Servant of the Lord, as a collective application, and consider it as a fingermark for this interpretation. לָמוֹ is usually employed with collective words." *Gesenius on Isaiah* liii. 8, vol. iii. p. 183. But why was Isaiah a representative of the prophetic race more than any of his brethren? Or how was his death an atonement for the transgression of others? If this word is significant of anything, it surely points out how the real representative of mankind was to die on behalf of *all* His brethren. In Him, whether for life or death, are all gathered together. He was by nature that "anointed servant" of God, which others were only in type and by office. He is Abraham's "seed," by whose single name the collective race is designated: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many, are one body, so also is Christ."

Only in Christ the Mediator, therefore, can be fulfilled the hope of men's regeneration; and the failure of all other attempts, whether on the side of polity or of religion, leads us back finally to Him. From Him proceed all the blessings of the Gospel covenant; for "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." The gifts, *i.e.*, of holiness and knowledge—the first resulting from His grace, the second from the communication of that truth which has its fountain in Him—are through His Mediation imparted to His brethren: "For this cause," He says, "came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice." And communion with Him is the very gift of righteousness, for "if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin; but the spirit is life, because of righteousness." These then are the two gifts, proceeding from the Mediator, which are the renewing principles of human society; so far as they go, they effect the regeneration of man, and accomplish those ends for which nature is yearning. How far these gifts of Holiness and Truth extend themselves, through what media, and with what result, must be shortly noticed.

I. In God only is Holiness. To be the *Holy One* is emphatically His name. "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts," is what Angels and Saints especially declare Him. From this natal source does the principle of holiness extend itself through the creation. "Ye shall be holy," is the command addressed to Israel, "for I the Lord your God am holy." But this blessing descends from heaven to earth through Him alone, by whom everything which is good is communicated from the one to the other. "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" Therefore, "as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Thus from its primary fountain in eternal Godhead does the blessing of holiness flow forth through the "one Mediator," into the Mystical body of Christ. It diffuses itself

as widely as the subjects of that mediatorial empire which He came to establish in the earth. All have the promise of sharing it, who belong to that spiritual kingdom, for which we daily entreat Him in the words of His own prayer. Here, then, is the real regeneration of man's society. Thus is planted the root of happiness, because thus is gained the favour of God. Here is the "kingdom of God among men;" "the days of heaven upon the earth." Thus is fulfilled the Blessed Virgin's promise: "He shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end." This is no earthly kingdom, because its principle of combination is the invisible though living power of grace: yet there results from it a real, lasting, operative, indivisible society—in part visible here on earth, though reaching also into the unseen world—extending through all countries, though subject to none—indifferent as to lineage, speech, or political institutions—its sole means of union being that the Manhood of Christ our Lord makes one body of all His members. For God "hath made Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

The effect of this work is as wide as the family of Christians, to say nothing of those innumerable ways in which the stream of God's mercy may overflow and extend beyond the appointed channel of His promises. For as Sodom would have been saved by fifty righteous, so do we hear of a time, when "but for the elect's sake," "no flesh should be saved." Yet what is the merit of the elect save their inherence in Him, whose perpetual Mediation delays the execution of the sentence passed on our common progenitor, which, by undertaking the office of Mediator, He interfered to arrest! For all the holiness of His Saints depends upon Him. But though the effects of Our Lord's Mediation are wide enough to take in all inheritors of the nature to which He united Himself, its proper reference is to those who are united to Him. The work of His Mediation has been shown to consist first of that Sacrifice and Intercession whereby

He once suffered on man's behalf, and whereby He continually pleads for His people. On these acts depends that holiness of the Body of Christ, on account whereof the name of the *Holy* Church especially belongs to it. For that holiness which is perfect must be the *imparted* holiness of Christ Our Lord, whereby He is "the Saviour of the Body." Whereas the *infused* holiness of grace, though perfect in itself, is a "treasure in earthen vessels." But Christ "loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word: that he might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." This, then, is that perfect righteousness of Christ's Atonement, which He imparts to His body. To this only St. Paul trusted, praying that he might "win Christ and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ." But a further gift is needed to render men "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light." For to retain an unbelieving heart and impure affections in the midst of this holy brotherhood, would be to defile the temple of the living God. Its proper members are those who are "rich in faith, heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love Him." To what purpose are men "translated into the kingdom of His dear Son," if they are found at last to be of those "children of the kingdom," who "shall be cast out into outer darkness"?

Besides, therefore, the *imparted* holiness, which belongs to true members of the Mystical Body of Christ, through His Intercession and Death, there needs that infused holiness which is produced in it by His Presence through the Spirit. For as the first part of our Lord's Mediation depends upon the reality of His Death and Intercession, so does the second upon the reality of His presence. In this manner does the Mediator work upon mankind: indwelling in the Church by grace through His

Sacraments. As an imparted holiness is the indispensable cause of our acceptance, so is an indwelling holiness also needed, because, without its influence, none profit by the former. As the imparted holiness of Christ obtains for men that "feast of fat things," which was the predicted blessing of the Gospel, so is His indwelling holiness that "wedding garment," without which they are not worthy guests. The first, therefore, is in every sense an external or objective blessing: the second is an internal or subjective qualification of the Body of Christ, which requires to be participated by all its members. For thus it is that the whole Church as a "building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." And the reason why the Baptism of Infants has ever been esteemed so signal and indispensable a blessing is, that it is God's appointed means for their first admission to the privileges of this mystic body. Its virtue does not depend on the prayers of the sponsors, whose attendance in private Baptism is not required, but on the life of Christ's Church, into which they are admitted. For no men, however faithful, can obtain salvation for others through the merits of their prayers: "no man can deliver his brother;" but the merits of Christ are large enough to extend saving efficacy through every living portion of His mystical body. These two, then, an imparted and an infused holiness, are communicated[1] "through the appointed means and channels of grace," as Bishop Andrews expresses it, to every living Christian, who, by "holding the head," "by joints and bands, has nourishment ministered." The first is that *in* which all the ransomed trust, saying, "Thou hast redeemed us by Thy Blood;" the second is that *by* which they obtain such "hope" as "maketh not ashamed." To follow out the last, as it becomes the internal and subjective life of every individual believer, would exceed the limits of this inquiry, to show how it assumes the forms of faith and obedience—faith

[1] "Legimus justificari in Christo qui credunt in eum, propter occultam communicationem et inspirationem gratiæ spiritalis, quâ quisquis hæret Domino unus spiritus est."—*S. Aug. De Pecc. Mer.* i. 10.

which is "given"[1] to us, and "obedience" to which men are "chosen through the Spirit."[2] But that which gives such importance to the agency of these inward principles;—the reason why they contribute, each in its degree, to our salvation, is not their inherent excellence, but that they are exalted through the holiness of Him to whom they unite us.[3] From Him alone flows all the indwelling as well as all the imparted holiness which pervades His mystical body. When we offer Him the service of faith, obedience and love, we offer that which is not only derived from Himself, but is only pure, if it is absorbed in the infinite amount of His perfect sacrifice. This union the Holy Ghost secures by maintaining our fellowship with Him. Therefore did the Apostle desire "that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."[4] For our actions have their consecrating virtue from Him: our prayers are hallowed by Him: "all things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee."

II. As God is the source of holiness, so is He likewise the fountain of knowledge. To be the simple and original depository of all truth is among the mysterious laws of His inscrutable existence. Therefore, did He declare Himself to His ancient people as "a God of Truth." By this character do the Prophets describe Him: "Thy counsels of old are faithfulness and truth." And in like manner has He been pleased to reveal Himself in the Gospel Covenant, for "this is the message which we have heard of Him, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all." And this light it pleased God to introduce into our lower world, when He created man as the image of His own perfections. The very chiefest excellence of which character was that

[1] Philip. i. 29. [2] 1 Peter i. 2.

[3] "Ea porro justitia qua vivit in seipsâ, proculdubio Deus est, atque incommutabiliter vivit. Sicut autem hæc, cum sit in seipsâ vita, etiam nobis fit vita, cum ejus efficimur utcunque participes: ita cum in seipsâ sit justitia, etiam nobis fit justitia, cum ei cohærendo juste vivimus, et tanto magis illi minusve cohæremus."—*S. Aug.* Ep. cxx. 19.

[4] Rom. xv. 16.

immediate intercourse which man's mind possessed with the Divine Unembodied Mind, of which it was the earthly reflection (p. 55). The loss of this direct irradiation from the fountain of light, was the greatest of those evils, which befell men through the Fall,—an evil which could not have been remedied, save through the mercy of that Being, who restored our forfeited inheritance, by bestowing it on us again in Himself. For "this is life eternal to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent." Thus hath "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God"—that glorious light of Deity, which God bestowed—through the image of it, which is reflected "in the face of Jesus Christ." When God, therefore, mercifully revealed Himself to *fallen* man, it was through that same Mediator, through whom the gift of holiness had originally been bestowed upon His creatures. The one Mediator, who had been the primary cause of all Divine light to humanity, by whom, and in whose image mankind was made, condescended to become their instructor. "The true light, which lighteth every man, was coming into the world." For this purpose it was necessary that He should first receive as man what He afterwards transmitted to His brethren. "My doctrine," he says, "is not Mine, but His that sent Me." Thus does the Incarnation form the basis of every portion of the Mediator's office. The unbounded store of Divine truth was transfused into His man's nature: in Him were "hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."[1] This belonged to Him by reason of His oneness with that centre of light, wherein truth has its fountain. And it was bestowed upon Him, that He might be a light to man's nature; that His body mystical might be filled with that light,

[1] Colossians ii. 3. As I have referred to this verse several times, it is proper to mention that if the critical arguments for supposing that it should be referred to our Lord are not entirely satisfactory, there is yet the strongest historical evidence for supposing that it ought to be attributed to Him.—Vide *S. Aug. De Trin.* i. 3, p. 751, and *S. Cyril Alex.* vol v. p. 784, and vol. vi. p. 382.

through grace, which belonged to Himself by nature. "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness."

This gift of knowledge, like that of holiness, is both an imparted and an infused or "*engrafted*"[1] gift: bestowed from without upon the faithful, as an object of contemplation; and communicated likewise to the body of the Church, as an internal principle of teaching and guidance. With both these is the mystical Body of Christ filled—that as man's acceptance is through that holiness which he has by union with the Head, so from the same source may he be "renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." For Divine knowledge is the impress and reflection of Him who is personally "the truth." The imparted knowledge which the Son of God has bestowed upon His Church is that whole system of the Gospel, which formed the subject matter "of all that Jesus began both to do and teach." This "Gospel of the kingdom of God"—"the Gospel" which St. Paul afterwards "received not after men, nor of men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ," which he declares so irrevocable, that what was contrary to it might not be admitted, though it was avouched by himself, "or an angel from heaven"—was not any of those four written histories which now bear the name of Gospels. For none of these documents were in existence, until after that system was fully matured, which is at present conveyed to us through all of them. "The Gospel" then, which St. Paul affirms that he "received" and "preached," is that complete system of the Christian faith, respecting which he reminds the Thessalonians, that "ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is, in truth, the word of God." This is the external, objective, imparted knowledge, "the Mystery of the Kingdom of God," which it has pleased the Mediator to make known either by His own immediate agency, or through the intervention of His servants. The infinite and unsearchable Truth which had its original being in the Person of the Word,

[1] St. James i. 21.

was set forth for the contemplation of mortals. By those who "know in part and prophesy in part," such an object must of course be imperfectly understood and thought of defectively. Yet is this the only means whereby the unattainable glory of the Great King can be communicated to His creatures. "The only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him." It is as a Personal Being, therefore, communicating with us through those functions of soul and body, which He has vouchsafed to share with ourselves, that the Eternal Word discovers Himself. But so far as the knowledge which He communicates is clothed in earthly words, it is as capable of being conveyed to those to whom it comes in books, as it was to those to whom it addressed itself through their hearing. Therefore were men who "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first" moved to "write in order," that subsequent generations might "know the certainty of those things, wherein" they had "been instructed." Thus did it please Him, who made Himself visible only to the men of one generation, to "pour out doctrine as prophecy, and leave it to all ages for ever." The fact that this treasure of objective truth is enshrined in Holy Writ, is proved, independently of internal witness, by the same evidence which assures us of the existence of such persons as Our Lord's Apostles. For those who speak of them as the witnesses from whom they received the Christian faith, and as their guides to its practices and institutions, refer also to the written depository of their sentiments, as containing that body of Divine truth for which they contended. A consecutive line of testimonies might be adduced, in proof that Holy Scripture was understood to have been handed down by Our Lord's Disciples to their successors, as that complete system of external truth, which through the one Mediator was delivered from God to man. It thus contains the objective body of Divine teaching, and the final[1] scheme of Revelation.

[1] A single testimony only shall be cited out of the innumerable list, both on account of its distinctness, and because it occurs in an author, whose

Thus has the permanent deposit of Christian truth been consigned to us by Him, who brought it to us from heaven. Having concentrated all knowledge in His own manhood, He afterwards diffused it among His brethren. Thus were the striking words of Ecclesiasticus illustrated; the "brook became a river," and the "river became a sea." He who took our nature was mercifully pleased to impart that knowledge of which He was the well-head. He might say in its fullest sense, respecting the merciful labours of His human economy, "Behold that I have not laboured for Myself only, but for all them that seek wisdom." Those holy words, which we know by the name of Scripture, were either spoken directly by Himself, in that body which He took to be one of ourselves, or they were uttered by men whose faculties were exalted through that spiritual power which by His Mediation He procured from

words have been sometimes supposed to have a different tendency. "It has been a matter of grave dispute," says St. Optatus to the Donatists, "whether Baptism in the name of the Trinity admits of being repeated. You say it may; we say, it may not: between your *may* and our *may not*, the minds of men waver and are at sea. Let no one pin his faith on you or on us: we are both partisans. Let us refer to a judge. And yet if the judge be a Christian, he will not be free from partiality. We must look abroad, then, for a judge; but if we take a Pagan, he will not be conversant with Christian mysteries; if we take a Jew, he will be an enemy to Christian Baptism: we shall hardly find a judge, therefore, upon earth—we must look to heaven. And yet why should we knock at the gates of heaven, when we have a testament in the Gospel? For in this instance we may rightly illustrate heavenly by earthly things: the case is like that of a person who has several sons; as long as the father is present, he himself gives directions to each of them; as yet no testament is necessary. So Christ, as long as He was present upon earth (although there is a sense in which He is still present), gave every necessary command, according to the occasion, to His Apostles. But [it happens now] as though the earthly father, when he felt himself on the verge of death, fearing lest after his removal disputes should arise between the brothers, should call for witnesses, and transfer his will from his dying breast to enduring tablets: then if a dispute should arise among the brethren, there would be no need of going to his tomb, but the testament would be referred to; he who lay tranquil in the grave would speak without voice from his tablets. The living Father, whose disposition we are inquiring after, is in heaven; therefore as you would learn a man's will from his testament, so let His be sought for from the Gospel."—*St. Optatus De Schis. Donat.* v. 3.

God for man. So that He is both "the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Those secret depths of the Divine wisdom, which are unfathomable to finite thought, were always within the range of His personal knowledge. "And of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." By virtue, therefore, of His Mediation, have those Divine truths, which were present to the mind of God, been presented through the medium of speech to the minds of mortals. This they still are, since they have been written in a book, just as much as when they sounded in men's ears. So "the Fathers of Nice," says St. Leo, "live throughout the world in their constitutions."[1] Much more then is He, through whom Divine Truth came down among men, to be looked upon as the present source of that external objective system of knowledge, to which His inspired Prophets and Disciples have given expression in Holy Writ.

But His gift of knowledge was not confined to an external truth: truth, like holiness, required also to be infused into the inner nature of mankind. Not only was the body of Christ enriched with that *imparted* treasure of truth, the Holy Scriptures; but likewise with the *engrafted* principle whereby it was able to comprehend them. The first was an object committed from without to the Church's keeping: the second was a gift of wisdom, bestowed along with other graces on that collective body, which the Head of the renewed race enlightened by His presence. The first, therefore, was an *objective* gift: something offered to the Church's contemplation, which it has to maintain, defend, and treat about; the second is a *subjective* gift to the Church, that internal and guiding principle of understanding, which it has to exercise upon the external truth committed to its care. And these two gifts must never be separated from one another. For they come from the same source, and each of them is essential to the full life of the other. Without the external system of truth in Holy Writ, the Church's mind would not have the advantages which are derived from a

[1] St. Leo, Ep. lxxx. p. 299.

written authority: without the internal Word which enlightens the Body of the Church, the sayings of Scripture would not be fully comprehended. Both kinds of knowledge are the result of that economy of Mediation, whereby the Incarnate Son has exalted humanity, by uniting it into one Body in Himself; and they contribute between them to the complete acquisition of whatsoever man's nature has capacity to attain.

This close connexion between the external gift of God's Word, and the inward gift of a spiritual discernment—between the Word, that is, as presented objectively in Holy Writ, and as acting subjectively throughout the Body of Christ—is evidenced as well by the name bestowed upon the Mediator in Scripture as by the account of His office. For why should He be called the *Word*, save with a view of showing how intimate is the relation between those written oracles, in which God's will is declared to us, and that Personal Word which abideth[1] in us? Thus do we learn that the Word by which believers are "born again" is identical with that "which by the Gospel is preached."[2] When we read that "the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword," "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," we are not unnaturally reminded of that mysterious depth of Holy Scripture which adapts it to all circumstances and times, so that none can read it without perceiving how it searches the conscience. And yet the meaning of the passage is not exhausted by such an interpretation: it passes on into the Personal acting of the great Being, whose spiritual presence enlightens men respecting the purpose of His own sayings, and reminds us, that there is no "creature that is not manifest in His sight, for all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do."

The same truth is discernible if we turn from the name of Mediator to the consideration of His office. For why has Holy Scripture its peculiar adaptation to man's nature, save because

[1] 1 John ii. 14. [2] 1 Peter i. 23, 25.

it is His *Word*, after whose image man was originally fashioned, and who is Himself the "true light, which lighteth every man"! Therefore, when we read it, we recognize the higher rule of our original composition. And His present office is declared in Holy Writ to be the extension of that informing and enlightening power, which He originally bestowed upon our nature. Thus only may man become capable of comprehending God's truth. The perpetual agency of the Living Word is needed to give effect to His written declarations. "I am come," He says, "a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in Me should not abide in darkness." "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world." This enlightening office the Word was to exercise in perpetuity through the power of the Holy Ghost. "The Spirit of Truth will guide you into all truth:" "for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you." And therefore, writes St. John, "the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie." Here, then, we have a part of that Mediatorial function, which belongs to Him, who condescended to take our nature. And since His office of Mediator has immediate reference to His mystical Body, to those whom, through the spiritual presence of His man's nature, He unites to Himself; to them, therefore, and for their benefit, must be this enlightening influence: the inward or subjective principle of perception, which is derived from Him who is "the way, the truth, and the life," must be infused into that collective society, through which individuals are associated to the manhood of Christ; and their portion in this inward teaching of the Word must be brought about through their inherence in His Body. And so does St. Paul teach us, referring the growth, stability, and knowledge of individual Christians, to their adherence to that Body of Christ, whereby the engrafted Word attains its maturity. "He gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers; for the

perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, *for the edifying of the body of Christ:* till we all come *in the unity of the faith* and of the knowledge of the Son of God, *unto a perfect man*, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but, *speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ.*" It is the same Eternal Word, whose Spirit inspired the Apostles and spake by the Prophets, who still condescends to guide into truth the whole Body of the Church; He dwells in it subjectively through grace to renew and purify its spiritual perceptions; He infuses an engrafted principle of knowledge, so that His written word becomes a real light to its else darkened understanding. The Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the root of David, prevails to open the Book and to loose the seals. Thus is an *engrafted* brought to bear upon an *imparted* knowledge—both derived to us from that Mediator whose immediate presence supplies the one, as through the ministry of His servants He has bestowed upon us the other.

Though the view which has been taken is fully set forth in God's Word, it may, to some minds, seem open to objection. That the external and imparted Word of Scripture may be duly understood, there needs, it is said, that infused influence of its Divine author, which He communicates to the Body of His Church. Scripture, therefore, cannot be understood without a divine light: that divine light is obtained for individuals through their inherence in the Christian community. Now, the privileges of reason may, perhaps, be alleged to be infringed by the first assertion: those of individual enlightenment by the second. To assert the necessity of a divine guidance may be thought to derogate from reason; to suppose that its light is communicated through Christ's collective Body may be supposed fatal to the

liberty of individuals. Such are the two objections which may be adduced. It will be seen in each case how dangerous is their tendency if admitted without limitation, and that their legitimate admission is not inconsistent with the truth which has been asserted. And first to consider the claims of reason. It is alleged, that since Scripture consists of words and propositions, its interpretation falls of necessity within the domain of reason. When we speak of Our Lord's body as material, we mean that it was an object to the senses of men: it might be seen and handled: and to express the will of God in language, is to submit it in like manner, it is contended, to the reasoning faculties of mankind. So that it is represented to be a sort of contradiction in terms, to speak of a revelation which does not appeal to the faculty of reason as the judge of its contents. Let us first observe how far this principle will lead, with a view of discerning, secondly, by what limitations it is necessary to guard it.

1. To admit the *exclusive* authority of human reason will be found to be fatal to the claims of revelation: so that along with the inward and subjective influence of an engrafted principle of divine guidance, the imparted and objective truth of Scripture would also be overthrown. That some such guide as reason must always be employed, follows of necessity from the fact, that men are liable to various impulses, which need, therefore, the direction of a controlling principle. Hence arises the *duty of private judgment*—the obligation, that is, of weighing seriously the contending impulses, by which the will is affected. Without such restraint, men will be perpetually vacillating between conscience and appetite. And their judgment of Holy Scripture would be decided by the principle which at the moment preponderated in themselves. To maintain the due authority of reason, therefore, is identical with an assertion of the responsibility of mankind. But such authority as this is, on all hands, attributed to reason. The ultramontanist who disobeys his sovereign's law, and the soldier who slays his brethren at its

bidding, act in conformity with the results, to which their judgments of Holy Scripture severally conduct:—the latter looks to the order to obey the King, whereas the former supposes that he is commanded to obey the successor of St. Peter. Whether their interpretations of Scripture be good or bad, they are at least commended to each of them by their individual reason. To respect the Church's authority, in like manner, does not imply any rejection of the claims of reason; all which it assumes is, that men suppose the Church's judgment of truth to be entitled to their confidence.[1] The notion of reason then, with which the admission of Church authority is inconsistent, must be something beyond this—something which not only assigns to each the duty of judging, but asserts his absolute independence. This is what appears to be designed by the *right of private judgment*. To be free from all deference for the opinion of others—to be entitled to disregard any motives or arguments, the force whereof he does not himself appreciate—to stand entirely alone, an individual essence, responsible only for such conclusions as find their way to him through intellectual processes, which are understood and approved by his own mind:—this may be claimed for each intelligent being as a right. If men's notions interfere with the external security of others, human laws will, of course, interpose for the protection of society; but mere opinions—the inward processes of the mind—may be supposed to be left so completely to each man's own discretion, that he is not called upon to pay any attention to the notions of others.

No doubt such a principle as this is inconsistent with the admission of Church authority. For though the Church has no earthly *power* of enforcing obedience, yet if she has "authority in controversies of faith," there must be an *authority* in her external judgments, which it must be the duty of individuals to respect. But to what result does the opposite system of ab-

[1] "Contra rationem nemo sobrius, contra Scripturas nemo Christianus, contra Ecclesiam nemo pacificus senserit."—*S. Aug. De Trin.* iv. 10.

solute independence conduct? Since the office of reason is to draw conclusions from premises, the nature of its conclusions must be determined by that of its premises. Whence are its premises derived? The school of Locke replies that they owe their existence to the senses. The simple impressions, which the senses supply, together with the multifarious combinations which are derived from them, make up those complex ideas, which, when drawn out into a series through the active power of the mind, are called a process of reasoning. Now if this be the origin of our knowledge, and if the mind may discard all considerations, which its own reason cannot appreciate, what place is left for revelation? As the vessel cannot be lifted above the water which floats it, so Holy Scripture cannot consist of things which are above the reach of the faculty, which is its competent judge. Such is the result of that theory, which, matured by Locke's subtiler and more consistent disciple, Hume, may be called the system of *Sensualism*. For by what sense do we admit the knowledge of God and things divine? They do not enter by touch or sight, by hearing or smelling. It is evident that on this hypothesis, the absolute independence of reason is fatal to revelation, and the attempt to subject God's Word to man's judgment results in the denial of His existence. So that along with the inward and subjective influence of an engrafted principle of divine guidance, the imparted and objective truth of Scripture would also be overthrown.

Even the opposite system, which may be called Intellectualism, though more promising, will conduct in the end to a similar result. The profounder Leibnitz, unsatisfied with the poverty of Locke's hypothesis, suggested that besides the ideas which flow in upon us from the senses, we must take account of the constitution of that agent which receives them. To Locke's principle, "nihil in intellectu nisi quod prius fuerit in sensu," he added, "nisi ipse intellectus." On this basis rests the far deeper and more comprehensive school of Kant. The philosopher of Konigsberg, following in a measure in Plato's steps,

took the laws of man's inner nature as an axiomatic foundation in his search after truth. Yet here again the difficulty recurs, how are we to find God and things divine? A metaphysical proof of God's existence may no doubt be derived from the inward laws of man's constitution; and there is such a thing, according to Kant, as "religion within the bounds of pure reason." But let it be admitted that man is not bound to believe anything which his own reason does not apprehend, and what place remains for revelation? Whence is it to be derived—how understood—in what manner authenticated? If the only principle of truth lies within ourselves, whence shall an outer rule approach us: if our inner powers are supreme, how shall it supersede their action; and since a system of miracles lies wholly beside those inward laws of thought which are the ultimate criterion, how is it to be believed?[1] It is not necessary to trace the effects of this system in Kant and his successors, or to refer to the well-known fact, that they reduce revelation to the statement of such truths as man's reason admits on other grounds: the recent words of an able and earnest-minded countryman of our own, by whom this system had been adopted, afford a sufficient specimen. "Imagine," he says, "a man pretending to survey the world, and all its wisest men, and to reconstruct the age, and writing down . . . . that external, historical testimony of God's revealed will is the only true basis of moral science. *As if all science is not within, and all morality. And as if anything external could be the basis of anything within.*"[2]

The last words show the effect of this system on one, whose

[1] Mr. Trench, on the *Miracles of our Lord*, pp. 66, 68, 2nd edition, has shown that there can be no satisfactory evidence for them, unless men possess that *predisposition* to believe the fitness of the Gospel scheme, which is among the first gifts bestowed by *preventing* grace upon the soul. This gift is bestowed through natural conscience in such measure as to supply the first step towards God: its subsequent development through union with the true fountain of light, grows in the renewed man into the fulness of a spiritual understanding.

[2] Sterling's *Life and Remains*, vol. i. p. 158.

national instincts must have rebelled against the total abnegation of a fixed external standard of belief. But let the control of individual reason be unchecked and unconditional, and it must necessarily involve all the results which are deduced from it by German philosophy. Each man's inner judgment becomes the only truth, and the divine realities which exist externally to us melt away. And yet this conclusion is at variance with those convictions of man's heart of which he cannot divest himself. For the external laws of nature reassert an influence, which the subtilties of logic in vain oppose. So that the testimony of our nature and the wants of society, bring back upon us those external realities which abstract reason would discard, and compel us to deny its unrestricted influence.

2. But how can we find a limit to the principle of reason, which without doing violence to its unquestionable authority, may yet supply an opening for those higher truths, which itself forbids us to reject? For on what does reason stand but the principles of our nature, and how can nature sanction conclusions abhorrent to itself? Now there can be no responding to the aspirations of humanity, unless we have some power of going out of ourselves. Our individual reason is not large enough to satisfy the cravings of our hearts. Each man must pass beyond the narrow precinct of his own thoughts—he must come forth and commune with heaven and earth, if he would appease the true longings of his nature. Such communion with things external to us is called *Faith*. This is its definition in Holy Scripture: "Faith is the realizing things hoped for, the putting to the proof things not seen."[1] Even our acquaintance with the material world depends on that conviction of the truth of our senses, which is a species of faith.[2] But its main function

[1] Hebrews xi. 1.

[2] "When a stone lies before me, I am conscious of certain sensations, which I receive from it; but when I say that these sensations come to me from an external object, which I *perceive*, the meaning of these words is, that receiving the sensations, I intuitively *believe* that an external cause of these sensations exists."—*Mill's Logic*, vol. i. p. 70.

is in the regions of the moral and of the unseen. For it is the recognition of that external law, which has its dwelling in the bosom of God. It is not merely the tracing out those conclusions, which are derivable from the intellectual constitution of every individual, but the actual communing with that external truth [1] which was pleased to have its reflection originally in man's mind. Now, since it was the will of Almighty Wisdom to form the first man after the model of Himself, some traces of this perfect truth will be found even in His fallen descendants. But faith is not employed merely in the discovery of these faint resemblances; it is that divine principle of which man has never been wholly deprived, whereby the great Author of our nature restores to us communion with Himself.[2] As a mirror does not show us outward forms, because they existed previously in itself, though they may happen to have been originally delineated on its surface, so Faith's office is to admit that higher light, whereby man may again give back the Divine image. And thus is it a principle beside and co-ordinate with reason [3]—a principle by which the authority of reason is limited at the same time that the stock of its knowledge is enlarged, because a new and independent condition is introduced into the conclusions to which reason conducts.

But this principle of faith must itself be under some control. It does not justify every one in believing as he will. Unless there be some rule and order in its operation, it will lose itself in

[1] "Knowledge properly is but our natural desire, or implanted blind love restored to sight; and nature doth as it were first grope after that, which at length she comes to see, and having seen desires to embrace." "As the seed since the first creation doth still in order of nature go before the tree, so doth knowledge always presuppose instinct or desire."—*Jackson's Works*, v. 51, 7.

[2] "Supra animam intellectivam humanam necesse est ponere aliquem superiorem intellectum, a quo anima virtutem intelligendi obtineat. . . . Plato intellectum separatum, imprimentem in animas nostras, comparavit Soli. . . . Sed intellectus separatus, secundum nostræ fidei documenta est ipse Deus."—*Summa*, i. Q. 79, 4.

[3] "Rationale est ut fides præcedat rationem."—*S. Aug.* Ep. 120, 3. "Credant ut intelligant."—*Id. in Joan.* xix. 15. *S. Anselm*, Proslog. I.

the vague and changeable lawlessness of individual eccentricity. What, then, is its criterion? By what ruling principle is it directed? Its limits must be determined by that law which gives it birth. Now its origin is that community of our nature, whereby it is enabled to prescribe bounds to each man's individual reason. If it be asked, why men are not justified in adopting those conclusions to which their single consciousness conducts—why they should admit more, than by processes within themselves they can ascertain and accept—the answer is, that they do not stand alone, that they are parts of a race, that He who made them has established certain laws, which find a response in their common nature, and has thus fixed His impress on their collective being. Let men be instructed in this community of mankind, and they could have no difficulty in admitting that those results, of which Faith assured them, were the voice of the Creator. Starting from the fact that they were all "the offspring of him that was first made from the earth," they must conclude that wisdom was "the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty."[1] And Revelation witnesses that men's natural power of appreciating moral truth is the gift of that Eternal Word, who never totally forsook the beings whom He had created. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." This is the deeper and divine[2] cause for that community and connexion of the souls of men, the natural and apparent grounds of which have been already stated (p. 36). But till this truth was revealed, there existed only those arguments for the community of mankind, which observation suggested. Yet these were enough to satisfy men of the existence of certain general laws, as speaking out of the deeper recesses of a common nature. The rule whereby each man's individual faith was to be regulated, was prescribed by the

[1] Wisdom vii. 1, 25.

[2] "Illa communicatio hominum in primis intelligibilibus demonstrat unitatem intellectus separati, quem Plato comparat Soli."—*Summa Theol.* i. 79, 5.

verdict of that collective being to which it owed its existence. Thus did men "show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." [1]

The breadth and importance of the rule thus provided are shown by the works of heathen moralists. And yet how was the verdict of natural conscience to be ascertained? For since men in general are swayed by passion rather than principle, the *conduct* of the majority can be no criterion of truth. The problem was to find the perfect pattern of humanity, the representative of those deep principles, which were imprinted in the constitution of the race. Such an example, when practically set forth, must command the respect even of those against whose defects it testified. For it is the nature of a race to put forth here and there some peculiar type of its characteristic qualities, to which its less distinguished examples are gradually assimilated. In this respect the works of genius illustrate the moral advancement of mankind. Every man is not capable of originating those sublime conceptions by which Newton unfolded the mechanism of the sky. The fervid imagery of Milton has added thoughts which but for him might never have formed part of the intellectual heritage of men. These and such prophets of humanity have opened to us secrets which it belongs to ordinary faculties to comprehend, but which they would have been unable to discover. Now, the same rule is applicable to man's moral state. When Plato says that if virtue could be personally exhibited, all men must delight in her; and when Aristotle [2] makes it dependent on the imitation of those, who

[1] When Mr. Hume quotes approvingly the sentiment, that adultery need not be considered a crime, unless it be felt to be an evil by the party injured, the judgment of mankind condemns him for neglecting that natural standard which, independently of any higher sanction, is provided by the inherent conviction of his race. He is setting up his private judgment against a truth which had commended itself to the faith of humanity.

[2] When Aristotle speaks of virtue in the abstract, he attributes it rather to the race than to individuals, because each individual is but an imperfect type of the principles which lie hid in the race at large (Politics, iii. 7);

have an intuitive perception of her principles, they assume the existence of some pattern and type of the race, which its other members have capacity to recognize. To be conformed to such models, to associate themselves to such standards of excellence, is the duty of ordinary men. Thus do they appreciate those principles of right and wrong which they would have been unable to originate. But it is on Faith only that such a rule of duty can depend. Those who will, may always represent it as a mass of contradictions. It presents no such distinct set of precepts as can control the unwilling mind. It satisfies none but those who possess that principle of belief, which prepares them to admit the existence of an external law. Such prepossession is a necessary condition for the acceptance of revelation, "for He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." But to reach forth in this manner after the Creator's will, with an antecedent perception that some rule of right has a real existence, is to make Faith an original source of knowledge; and, therefore, to limit the supremacy of individual reason, by assuming the existence of higher truths than are attainable through the senses or intellect of mankind.

The mere existence of Faith, therefore, as a necessary prerequisite to the acceptance of revelation, or even to the admission of the moral government of God, implies that some limit must be assigned to individual reason. But is such natural faith, as is our guide in unfolding the laws of Providence, a sufficient guide also to the understanding of that *imparted Word* which is communicated in the Scriptures? Is it sufficient for every one to study God's Word by the light of his own conscience, without

but his practical mode of attaining it is in every case the imitation of those in whom the intuitive perceptions of moral faith have been strengthened by good conduct. "ὡς ἓν ὁ φρόνιμος ὁρίσειε."—*Eth. Nic.* ii. 6. He supposes the moral eye of the φρόνιμος to be an original source of knowledge, through its inward intuition. "δεῖ προσέχειν πῶν. . . . φρονίμων ταῖς ἀναποδείκτοις φάσεσι καὶ δόξαις. διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἔχειν ἐκ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ὕμμα, ἀρῶσιν ἀρχάς."—*Eth. Nic.* vi. 11.

the aid of that *engrafted Word* which is communicated to the Body of the Church?

Now, here must be borne in mind the characteristic distinction between Christianity and Rationalism; namely, that the second rests on that knowledge and those means of intercourse with God, which we have by Creation, whereas the former looks to the Mediation of our Incarnate Head. For in Him we have the full expression of that principle, after which Heathen teachers were reaching in vain. He is the true pattern of our race, the real type of humanity, the complete exemplification of all those excellences which were reflected in the pure nature of our original parent. This perfection He exhibited, not merely, as Rationalism would have it, through the happy tempering of His natural qualities, but because in His Person there entered into our race a supernatural power. For thus was humanity made perfectly partaker of the Divine nature; in His Person were "hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." The faculties which God gives to every one in such inferior degree as is needed for the affairs of this life, dwelt in such sublimated intensity as our understanding is incapable of estimating, in Him to whom God gave the Spirit without measure. And as in Him was the only perfect pattern of humanity, so in union with Him is the only real source of knowledge.[1] For not only did He give to Faith a higher object in the revealed truths of the Gospel, but He exalted the principle of Faith itself through that higher nature which He communicated to His earthly members. "For by grace are ye saved, through Faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Thus are Christian Faith and Christian Reason no longer the natural judgment of the children of creation, but the inspired judgment of the children of grace. Through the union of each individual with the Pattern of Humanity, are his natural qualities exalted. His inferior faculties are re-moulded on the perfect type of

[1] "Apprenons de la vérité incréée et incarnée notre véritable nature."—*Pascal's Thoughts.* [*Faugere*] vol. ii. 104.

manhood. If the influence of natural excellences could minister to the first birth of Faith, and thus extend the conclusions of reason, what may not be expected from real oneness with Him, in whom Faith was swallowed up in sight, and reason matured into intellectual intuition?

And yet here too, as in the province of natural faith, individual judgments must be regulated by some controlling principle For even the conclusions of holy and good men are liable to be influenced by private eccentricity. The Scriptures may be misunderstood as well as the laws of Providence. Yet the truth itself is one and unalterable, however variable and fallacious are the opinions of men. Its reflection must be sought for, then, in the judgment of the regenerate race, as the verdict of natural conscience in the sentiments of collective humanity. But since this higher reason is not built upon the mere development of those faculties, which by creation were imparted to our race, but on the communication of grace from Him who is the fountain upon earth of heavenly knowledge, therefore its principle of reference is not to any human exemplifications of goodness, but to that source itself, from which man is made participant of the Divine wisdom. So says the Apostle, referring the gift of Christian perception to that mind of the Spirit, which the natural man does not partake. It is because "we have the mind of Christ" that he claims a power of "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" for himself, and for those who shared with him in the fellowship of the Lord's Mystic Body. The heathen had no further test for natural conscience, than as individuals exhibited a fainter or clearer example of that gift which had been bestowed originally upon man; but the Christian looks to that storehouse which has been provided in the manhood of our Divine Head, as the medium through which wisdom must be expected, as well as graces. It is from union, therefore, with that collective body, through which Christ vouchsafes His presence, that he anticipates the one as well as the other. The gift of faith, the power of understanding, the

inward light of a higher reason—these are among the blessings which Mediation obtains, and which flow in perfection from Incarnate Godhead into the members of His Mystical Body. So that we come back to the very position from which we started, and find the proper limitation of reason, in its exercise on things Divine, to be its subordination to that engrafted gift of heavenly guidance, which the Mediator bestows upon the body of His Disciples. For the authority of reason is limited only by that principle of faith, which at the same time enlarges its sphere of vision. The existence of an infused, subjective gift of truth in the body of Christ's Church, as the fit correlative and expositor of that objective truth of God's Word, committed to it in writing, turns out to be the exact condition which gives full scope to individnal minds. The general action of the collective body on the external truth to which it witnesses, provides the limits within, and by help of which the individual thought can be profitably exercised. For the security of individual judgment depends upon the constant influence of that guiding principle which comes from a higher power; and this influence is derived from the efficacy of that Mediatorial system, which extends through the collective body of Christ into individual minds.

This is what is meant, then, when the Church system is opposed to that of individual reason. The ultimate reference is to the great representative of man's race, as the only channel through whom truth descends from God to man. In Him alone is the perfection and standard of wisdom, which as a Divine gift can be only obtained perfectly from a Divine giver. And the gift of truth being bestowed through His Mediation, must extend itself like His other blessings, to that body of the Church, which is the seat of His life-giving presence. Through union with this collective body is the benefit communicated to individuals. The guidance thus exercised over the Church at large, the engrafted efficacy of the Word, supplies each man with a fixed guide, which adds intensity and confidence to his

private meditations. Were Scripture designed to teach worldly truths, the capacities which were bestowed on men by Creation would render them competent students of its pages—especially if they sought that wisdom from a higher Being, which, according to the principles of nature, must be looked for from their Creator; but this would be only a Rationalistic study of Scripture, which could not be expected to open the deeper mysteries of the Word. The higher truths of the Gospel, like its larger graces, are among the gifts which are bestowed upon man through Mediation; and it is only through those means which associate us with the Body of Christ that we can discern and appreciate them. Thus is man's spiritual eye opened to those fundamental principles, which form the basis of all reasoning respecting questions of Faith, and which occupy the same place in the interpretation of Scripture, which is held by the cardinal truths of morals in respect to the practical affairs of life.

It is the absence of these primary principles which renders so many persons incapable of discerning the beauty and reality of the Church system, and thus leads them to wander in the unsatisfying paths of private speculation. But since the system of Mediation is in advance upon that of Creation, the Church's judgment respecting the meaning of Scripture, which is built upon the first, must be preferred to that of private reason, which is built upon the second. Its authority rests upon the fact, that it is *His* mode of instructing us, from whom only issues true light. And yet the Church's mind does not proceed on rules alien to the course of private reason, but only higher and more comprehensive. The preceding pages have marked out the course, by which the wisdom of God guided her from a recognition of the single facts of revelation to "the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father and of Christ." In all this is there an exact progress from cause to effect, which the highest reason may admire, but which Faith refers not to the mere process of human deduction,

but to that infused Spirit of Truth, to which pertains guidance as well as sanctification. Thus does the line of truth ascend from the single fact of our Lord's worship, till it loses itself in that primary doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, which is the basis of knowledge. And from this point does it again pass downward, till the operations of the interceding Word and sanctifying Spirit are recognized as underlying the whole scheme of our thoughts. This system, collected into Creeds, is what gives fixedness and guidance to individual minds. To enshrine such truths in Creeds is a claim on the part of that collective body which propounds them, to the engrafted influence of that guiding Word by which only the Word written can be surely elucidated. And the evils which result from their neglect are a sufficient proof how essential is the one of these principles to the maintenance of the other. In those parts of Christendom, and among those individuals, by whom the Church's judgment as expressed in Creeds is lightly thought of, the paramount authority of God's Word as an objective ground of truth is equally endangered. The inspiration of Scripture, on which depends its existence as the imparted record of objective truth, is found to depend practically on the recognition of that infused principle of judgment, which has been asserted to belong to the Mystical Body of Christ.

A few words are needed respecting this remarkable proof of connexion between the written and the living Word. It has been matter of observation and surprise that our formularies should dwell so much on the importance of the Holy Scriptures, yet say not a word respecting their inspiration. What is meant when we speak of them as inspired? Various theories are afloat on the subject, yet neither the collective Church, nor our own branch of it, have thought it necessary to offer an explanation. These theories moreover are found to prevail exactly in those quarters in which the Church's authority as a "keeper" as well as "witness" of Holy Writ is denied; as though to invent some scheme of inspiration was the necessary correlative of denying

the existence of that living Word, which guides men through Creeds, and has been engrafted in the body of the Church. One theory would hold Scripture to be good authority for things divine, but not for things human. But by what criterion we are to discriminate between things human and things divine, is not determined. Another supposes that conclusions were revealed to the Apostles, which it was left to themselves to develop and ascertain by the uncertain resources of human reason. But how are we to separate between the wheat and the chaff? between the Divine conclusions which we must believe and reverence, and the human arguments, which we may scoff at and reject? Again, the notion that the sacred writers were mechanical agents, whose words were dictated by the Holy Ghost, has the advantage at all events of promising to effect what a theory of inspiration might be expected to attain. Its maintainers, however, besides demonstrating its truth, should show how it harmonizes with what history tells us of the formation of the Sacred Canon. For since the Apostles were not always mechanical agents, the cases in which they obeyed so singular a law would require to be distinguished by some unquestionable criterion from their usual actings; and what was thus cut off from their common teaching, would need to be guarded by an authority as distinct as that which originally discriminated it. How far is this compatible with the gradual admission of disputed books into the Canon during a period of more than three centuries? It is not to the present purpose, however, to question the accuracy of these theories of inspiration, but to inquire why no theory at all is offered to us by the Church. Now the object of all such theories is of course to maintain important truths, which might otherwise be called in question. Some article essential to man's salvation is rested upon a particular text or expression, and unless this expression or text can be shown to be inspired, and unless inspiration imply the truth of what is communicated, it is feared that the whole superstructure of Faith may be overthrown. When Bishop Hampden is pressed by

St. Paul's authority, "I appeal," he says, "from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching."[1] Allow this principle, and since St. Paul was arguing against Jews, who were schooled in the system of atonement, why might not his references to Our Lord's Mediation have been only an argument *ad hominem* designed to prove that on their own theory Jesus was the Messiah? How does this writer discriminate therefore between those assertions of St. Paul which we must admit, and those which we may disbelieve? Any logical proof then of the fundamentals of religion requires that its basis should be laid in a consistent theory of inspiration. Unless this foundation is sound, the superstructure will be precarious. If it be not fixed, equable, and coherent, it must be bound together by such artificial concretion, as may promise the solidity of a rock. And the reason why the Church has never put forth any theory of inspiration, is because building on the rock itself, she stands in no need of such factitious expedients. For when has she rested her belief in the fundamentals of truth on any logical deduction from individual expressions? Unfold the record of her public assertions, the decrees of those four Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon (to say nothing of that original one at Jerusalem), to which the English law refers as her criterion of heresy, and in which of them is any reference made to individual expressions, as though the Church supposed that the logical sequence of her doctrines was to be demonstrated argumentatively to the intellect of men? To do so would have been to assign to human reason the exact office, which has been shown already to be inconsistent with the very principles of revelation. Or to pass to our own eighth Article, by which the authority of the three Creeds is asserted. Is this article designed to be a conclusion from admitted premises, or an appeal to subsequent demonstration? If it be the latter, why is no demonstration offered? Why are not the passages adduced, by which

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, 8th, p. 375.

the Church hopes to conciliate the intellectual acquiescence of those whom she desires to gain? Her principle therefore is plainly the same with that of the Church universal in all her determinations. The principles which she lays down are accordant with Scripture; and her ground of confidence in her conclusions is their consistency with that objective system of truth which was once for all imparted to her by the Holy Ghost. But she does not attempt to establish them by deduction from individual expressions, because her appeal is not to human logic, but to God's Spirit. The imparted objective truth of the Word written, requires the engrafted subjective influence of the living Word as its expositor. Such an endowment was always asserted for that company of faithful men to whom was "revealed" "the wisdom of God in a mystery," and in whose name the Apostle asserts, that "we have the mind of Christ." We see an example of its mode of acting when a dispute arose whether it was expedient that women should act as ministers. St. Paul decides it by referring not only to his own judgment, but to that of the collective body, on which was bestowed the grace of spiritual comprehension: "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." Therefore does the Church refer to testimony, as showing what was that view of the truths of Scripture, which this living witness has always taken; and to grace, as guiding the collective members of Christ in the exposition of His Word. Not of course that this higher medium of truth interferes with such intellectual study of Holy Writ as may show its deep truth and perfect harmony. But what supersedes the necessity of dependence on mere human logic, is that efficacy of the Mediator's Presence, which alone is an adequate guide to the comprehension of His imparted Word. So that individuals are successful in the elucidation of Scripture, not merely through the native shrewdness with which God has blessed them, but because their natural powers are elevated by connexion with that supernatural system, through which they participate in Christ. Hence those

many writers by whom the marvellous richness of Scripture has been illustrated: thus are the individual testimonies to Our Lord's nature enforced by the dialectic vigour of Athanasius and Bull, and the deep truths respecting His presence in Sacraments expounded by the profound sagacity of Hooker and Augustin. Yet these writers refer constantly to the "Analogy of the Faith;" they have no confidence in mere human logic when illustrating God's Word written: their conviction is plainly avowed that they need that teaching of His living Word, which dwells through grace in the body of those who are united to Him. And among their many rich legacies to the Church, no theory of inspiration is included. They were contented with believing Scripture to be God's imparted Word, leaving undetermined that which He has not been pleased to reveal, namely, what are the exact intellectual limitations by which we may discriminate His indestructible truth from the perishable clay of His earthly instruments. The settlement of this question, absolutely essential to those who would build their faith on mere logical inference from the text of Scripture, was wholly unnecessary to men who looked to a Divine interpretation of its sacred words. For all such theories of inspiration are devices for building up a system of Divine truth by man's reason. They are bulwarks, erected in the well-meaning but ineffectual hope of rendering God's Word an available auxiliary, in battles which are to be waged with the mere weapons of human logic. But Scripture, like the ark in the camp of Israel, has been found to give small advantage to those who thus employ it. Such bulwarks have rather prejudiced revelation than secured it. For its strength rests on another principle. The Word written implies the Living Word as its constant correlative: the one receives, applies, interprets the other: the settlement what questions are fundamental, and on what basis they depend, lies too deep for man's unaided understanding, and must be referred therefore to the teaching of that Divine power, which is the appointed guide into all truth.

And if this statement seems to any one a disparagement from the authority of Holy Writ, let it be observed that its contrary tendency may be shown, not by argument only, but by experience. For by whom is Holy Scripture treated with that reverence which belongs to a divine revelation? And in what quarters, on the other hand, has it either been curtailed or rejected? Have not such attempts been made in the most flagrant and pertinacious manner, by those very parties by whom the Church has been denied to possess that "authority in controversies of faith," which our Article ascribes to her? With a belief in the engrafted Word dwelling in the Body of Christ, all fitting reverence for the imparted Word has almost invariably been abandoned. What Book of Scripture has not been rejected in some part or other of Protestant Germany? And the only bodies which have retained that deep reverence for Holy Writ so conspicuous in the early Church, have been such portions of those who bear the Christian name, as like it profess to recognize that influence of the Living Word which dwells in His Body Mystical.

And here we may pass to the other objection which it was proposed to notice: the assertion, *i.e.*, that God's illumination is wholly an individual gift, and has no relevancy to that Body Mystical of Christ Our Lord, through which its benefits are said to be derived. But before entering upon this subject, it will be well to pause for a moment, and reiterate with somewhat more fulness what is the exact point which in the preceding pages has been maintained. For there may be readers whom the foregoing argument fails to convince, because it seems at variance with their personal observation. And when this is the case, demonstration may silence men, but cannot satisfy them. And yet that which has been asserted is, in truth, nothing more than is declared by St. Paul, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Now, if we are to look to grace for the gift of understanding, it must

needs flow in the channel of those blessings, which the Mediator has brought down from heaven ; and its appointed course, therefore, will be through that Body Mystical, which He unites to Himself through the efficacy of His Body natural. But against this statement rises up the philosopher on one side, and the earnest-minded Christian on the other ; and they point out numerous individuals, not united, as they say, to Christ through His Mystical Body, by whom the Word of God has been studied, commented upon, and illustrated, not only by their writings, but (which is far more important) by their lives. The case of individual enlightenment by God's Spirit shall be spoken of shortly : at present let it only be observed, that the existence of an infinite number of such cases is freely admitted, and that the fact is not inconsistent with what has been asserted in the foregoing pages. To the philosopher it may be said that such measure of illumination as may suffice for the first understanding of Holy Writ, was bestowed according to the law of their creation upon all men ; and if such great progress was made even by Heathen moralists both in understanding and virtue, how much more may be expected from those who possess also the invaluable records of inspired Scripture. But the Christian will look far higher than this : he will assert, what no man can deny, that love, faith, and obedience are found in large measure among those who have never enjoyed the advantage of being joined to Christ, through the Sacraments of His Grace ; that their virtues often put to shame the vices of those who by adoption are members of Christ's body ; and also that their excellences must be the result of grace, because they are professedly referred to Christ and His Holy Spirit. And as he will infer from this circumstance that they possess the gift of a spiritual understanding, so he will assert that their words and writings often exhibit it. Yet what is there in this, with whatever latitude it is admitted, which negatives those distinct statements of Holy Writ, wherein Christ the Mediator is stated to bind men to Himself in His Body Mystical, through the efficacy

of that body natural, whereby He united Himself to us? Is it to be denied that God has appointed a channel for His graces, because the flood of His mercy overflows its banks? Doubtless these graces flow from that one Mediator, who is expressly declared in Holy Writ to be the one only name through whom comes salvation. And wheresoever they are found, we thank God for their effect. We recognize it as well in the understanding, whereby such persons enter into Scripture, as in the holiness, whereby they obey it.

Now here, probably, men's objection will turn round; if you admit, they say, what is sufficient for our argument, you admit what is too much for your own. Such an admission as this, it is asserted, is in reality the substitution of a new principle: it is like those collateral streams, which in short space change the bed of the great rivers of the West. It may be replied, in the first place, that to object on this ground to the plain testimony of God's Word is one of those arguments from man's ignorance, which, as Bishop Butler has proved, are in their nature inconclusive. Many reasons may exist, beyond the reach of our short-sighted vision, why God may have seen fit to provide an appointed mean of union with Christ, with which in cases innumerable it may please Him to dispense. But the existence and blessing of the Divine System, of which Scripture tells us, may in this case be discerned, however large our allowance of co-existent exceptions. Nothing shall be said at present of the gift of holiness, on account of the difficulty of finding tests indicative of collective morality: and because what is under consideration is the gift of truth. Now this blessing is in fact maintained even in those exceptional cases which have been adduced, through the medium of that collective Body of Christ, to which the gift of spiritual understanding has been promised. For whence come that belief in God's imparted Word, and those first notions respecting the scheme of Christianity, with which such persons start on their independent march? They get these things from the general Body of Christ.

though ignorance, prejudice, or the scandal of the Church's permitted sins, unhappily prevent them from obtaining all the benefits which it is intended to dispense. Hence the partial, self-conflicting, uncertain views which the best men of this class commonly take of Scripture. That simple goodness is no barrier against this uncertainty, is sufficiently shown by the continual conflicts in which such men are engaged with one another. Their conflicts differ essentially from those of Churchmen, because while the latter admit the authority of that spiritual sense, into which the Church has been guided by the Spirit (whatever difficulty may exist at times in determining it), the disputes of independent expositors of Scripture are without umpire and without end. And yet the Church's testimony supplies the very groundwork on which they base their discussions; for all Christian interpreters must start of necessity from an admission of Scripture's inspiration. But till it is explained what is meant by the term Inspiration (and no such solution has yet been found as may supply the basis of a mere logical system of religion), all private interpretations contain within them the inevitable seed of unbelief. They suffice probably for those who, in a pious but limited view of things, have first adopted them; but no sooner do they pass into the hands of the next generation, than their consistency is put to the proof, and they are found wanting in coherence. Hence it happens almost invariably that such parties as began by separating from the Church on one principle, work their way to the opposite extreme of error. The Puritan Nonconformists who accused the Church of not resting sufficiently on Christ, were the ancestors of the present Socinian school, by whom the Church is asserted to rest on Him too exclusively. Germany, where men complained so loudly because Scripture was not duly appreciated, is the only country probably in the world where its authority has not only been denied, but the very existence of its authors has been publicly disputed. Against such errors what has made head, but that inward belief in

Scripture, and that objective system of truth, which has lived in the Church and through the Creeds! What a basis have these things supplied even to those who were least conscious of their obligation! How often have the words of the Church sounded forth in her public confession, while those who heard them from the lips of the minister knew not that the Creeds thus promulgated were, in fact, the living truths on which the faith of the whole land was unconsciously dependent, and that many a private speculator who fancied himself guided only by his individual spirit, was thereby withheld from errors, which would else be fatal to his peace. How much greater has been the advance of heresy, how much bolder the irreverent rejection of God's imparted Word, where such testimony of His Word engrafted has not been a present witness. For thus has the Church, in her raiment of sackcloth, been testifying for centuries in the streets of that busy and unbelieving world, which cannot bring itself altogether to reject what its concupiscence will not allow it to obey. But then, it is asked, why may not this witness be merely inward and personal? Suppose it admitted that reason is not competent without grace to master things divine, why has that grace any connexion with Christ's Body? In this case, then, as before, the full tendency of the notion of individual enlightenment must first be exhibited, and it must afterwards be shown under what qualifications it may safely be admitted.

1. To assume the existence of an individual illumination, has not been an unfrequent or unnatural reaction against that unsatisfying system which professes to subject God's Word to mere reason. Earnest minds are disgusted by the cold, hard, critical, irreverent manner in which Scripture is treated. Its dogmas are drawn out as logical deductions by human intellect, and a respect is demanded for them which is only due to the wisdom of God. This system has prevailed to a certain extent even in our own country: for its unchecked predominance we must look to what was called the orthodox Lutheranism of the seventeenth century.

Against it there rose up George Fox in England and Semler in Germany. The argument of Fox and of all the early Quakers, was that the letter of God's Word was nothing without that guiding Spirit by which it was originally indited. "Writing-paper and ink," said Fox to Baxter, "is not infallible." In like manner did Semler protest, that a body like the German Protestants could recognize no paramount authority in its original founders, which could shackle in perpetuity the minds of men. The formulas of Luther and Calvin might be good, but it was for every individual to judge of their goodness. He therefore agreed with Fox in looking for an individual guidance, which both expected must come from above. But what was the result of their theory? In both cases it led to the denial or depravation of that objective and imparted truth of Holy Scripture for which in the first instance both seemed most anxious. "The only evidence," says Semler, "for the divinity of a book is inward conviction through the truths contained in it: this is divine faith, which, by a somewhat obscure scriptural expression, is called the testimony of the Holy Ghost in the reader's mind." "In conformity with this rule be expunged from the Canon, Solomon's Song, Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Chronicles," etc.[1]

If the conduct of the Quakers was not quite so arbitrary, the result was nearly the same.[2] It followed naturally from the

[1] Tholuck's *Vermischte Schriften*, vol. ii. p. 56.

[2] "What other sort of men that call themselves Christians," writes Leslie, "have abused the Scriptures by the contemptible names of *Beastly Ware, Dust, Death, Serpent's Meat*," etc.—*Snake in the Grass*, 7, vol. ii. p. 57. And if this be said to refer to the letter of the Scriptures as opposed to their inward meaning, yet how is any great respect for them compatible with the statement of Barclay, recorded by their friendly historian? "We utterly deny," he says, "that in true Christians the Scriptures, or outward history in the Scriptures, is the principal motive, foundation, or principal rule of that historical faith, much less of saving faith, to the producing of which the letter of the Scripture doth very frequently (as to many of its acts, if not all) not concur or co-operate,"—*Sewel's Hist. of Quakers*, vol. ii. p. 350. This accords with a maxim which Leslie attributes to them: "That which is spoken by the spirit of truth in any, is of as great authority as the Scriptures and Chapters are, and greater."—*Snake in the Grass*, sec. 7, vol. ii. p. 60.

supposition that Divine enlightenment did not flow forth into humanity through that channel which has been opened through the Mediation of Christ, but was bestowed *immediately* by God on man. Let this be admitted to be God's ordinary mode of imparting spiritual gifts (the possibility of special and extraordinary communications has already been admitted), and the consequences deduced by Semler and the Quakers must inevitably follow. The notion is akin to that which would assert reason to be a final arbiter respecting things Divine. Those who claim this province for reason, consider that it is the voice of the Great Spirit of the Universe, speaking according to that system of natural religion which only they allow. And individual inspiration is in like manner an immediate reaching forth to that ultimate Governor between whom and man's spirit nothing is supposed to interfere. Those who call themselves Christians, it is true, use the name of Christ, when speaking of the Being they refer to. And their affections, we may hope, are likely to be quickened by the narrative of sufferings patiently undergone, and of graces supernaturally predominant. But Christ the Mediator bestows the blessings which He confers through union with His man's nature: this union is obtained through His Body Mystical; it results from that peculiar oneness with Himself which renders individual dependent on collective blessings, and joins all the members of His Church into one spiritual whole. If these circumstances, characteristic of the Son, are left out of sight, the name of Christ becomes a mere title of Sovereign Deity, and the Being whom men reverence ceases to be that Son Incarnate who has vouchsafed to become the Head and Representative of mankind. So that the direct reference to the Great Spirit of the Universe, which is independent of these considerations, harmonizes with a Sabellian view of Christ's nature, and not with that reality of His Mediation which is taught by the Church. And however large the peculiar communication to individuals of special mercy, yet to make this the ordinary course of Gospel graces, would be to set aside the Mediation of

Christ Our Lord. And the depreciation of Holy Scripture is an immediate consequence. For whether we take reason or individual inspiration as the principle of union, what is there in either case which can stand between God and the soul? According to the Church's teaching, a scheme of mediation has been appointed between God and man. Christ's manhood bridges over the gulf between them. It communicates truth objectively through the gift of the Scriptures, and at the same time bestows the faculty of comprehending them on those who are united in one Body to Himself. The one of these cannot interfere with the other, because the medium which communicates them is the same. But of what use are such intervening steps to those who by immediate access can draw nigh to God? If their own private feeling be the test of that inspiration, which drinks at once from the primary fountain of truth, why not when it sets aside Scripture, as much as when it respects it? The same circumstance, then, which supersedes the engrafted Word, supersedes the imparted Word also. Every act of communication to those who are thus favoured is as good as Scripture. When Fox heard a minister at Nottingham tell the people that "they were to try all doctrines, religions, and opinions, by the Scripture, he felt such mighty power and godly zeal working in him, that he was made to cry out, 'O no, it is not the Scripture, but it is the Holy Spirit, by which the holy men of God gave forth the Scriptures, whereby opinions, religions, and judgments are to be tried.'"[1] Thus, from rejecting that living Word which is engrafted in the Body of Christ, he passed by obvious transition to the rejection of the Word imparted, which is its natural correlative. The same process which overleaped one barrier overleaped the other.

2. This leads us then, secondly, to the necessary caution by which the doctrine of individual enlightenment requires to be guarded. True, without an individual inspiration of God's Spirit we are unable to understand His words. But this

[1] Sewel's *History of Quakers*, vol. i. p. 36.

Inspiration must rest upon the intervention of Christ Incarnate, instead of being independent of it. It is not *immediate*, but derivative from the Mediation of Christ. First comes that gift which Our Lord has purchased for collective humanity, whereby He unites all His true members into one body in Himself. Dependent on this is that communication of Himself to individual souls, whereby the blessings of knowledge, as well as those of grace, are conferred upon them. To consider these a gift which comes from God, independently of Christ, is to deny our participation in His office of Mediation. We cannot speak too highly of this enlightening blessing, so long as we maintain that due subordination which keeps up the recollection of its source. It is ever relevant to Christ as the engrafted Word dwelling in the Body of His Church, as well as to Christ the imparted Word teaching in His Scriptures. While we reverence the one of these, we shall pay due deference to the other. So long as we respect Christ teaching us by the general guidance of His Church, we shall be in no danger of the error of those who set "their light within above the Scriptures, by refusing to let their light within be judged by the Scriptures."[1]

To maintain Church authority, then, is to assert the empire of grace as opposed to that of nature; to make the gift of divine knowledge a consequence and portion of the Mediation of Christ, and Christ Incarnate the sole cause of man's enlightenment. It is a result of the truth that God is wiser than man. Other views would throw men either upon the competency of nature, or upon gifts obtained from God independently of Christ and His Gospel; but the Church system is equivalent to the system of Christ's Mediation: knowledge is bestowed by Him upon His Body Mystical, and the gift of individual enlightenment is subordinate to men's general relation to Him. But are there not difficulties, it may be asked, in this system, and in particular, does it not give the collective Church an authority inconsistent with the

[1] Leslie, *ibid.* p. 57.

ultimate supremacy of God's Word? For if the Church be guided by the engrafted Word, is not the imparted Word superseded by its power? Does not the same difficulty recur which was found to attach to individual inspiration—that every act of it was a virtual superseding of all previous communications? Do not those who begin by idolizing Scripture, end commonly by idolizing themselves? And what guarantee have we, that the Church at large shall not fall into the error, of which experience has convicted every enthusiast from Montanus to Naylor? Now to this it may be replied, in the first place, that the body for which an infused power of guidance is claimed, is the very same whose witness is appealed to on behalf of the Word imparted. For what proof have we of the authority of those books which pass by the name of Scripture, unless some confidence can be placed in the spiritual discernment of that Body of the Church by which they were at first acknowledged to be God's Word? And this acknowledgment having been once made, the Church cannot decide anything which is inconsistent with its own decision. It cannot supersede that imparted Word which it has once adopted as the truth of God. This objective body of truth, no set of men, no generation, not the collective Church in all time, has power to dispense with. It is fixed once and for ever. And if it be asked further, what proof we have that the collective Church *will* not attempt to get rid of it, the answer, besides our general trust in God's Providence, is, that against this danger Christ Our Lord has promised us protection. For such an act would be an apostasy on the part of the Universal Church, into which He has promised that she shall never fall. His declaration is that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against her. He assures us of His presence with her to the end of the world. Such an attempt, therefore, as would endanger her witness to the Word imparted, need never be feared, because such a desertion as would imply the removal of the Word engrafted can never happen. Indeed, what but this has insured such measure of discretion, amidst the innumerable collisions of

eighteen hundred years, that the Body, with which dwells the Living Word, should still be the witness and keeper of written Scripture? That the Church, therefore, *will not* attempt to dispense with Scripture—that the collective Body of Christ will be faithful to its trust—this is matter of belief to those to whom Christ's promise is a ground of confidence.

There have been times, it is true, when the use of such a guide was more apparent than at present. The miserable divisions which have distracted the Church interfere with the applicability of the principle, and weaken its effects. We live, like Israel, in a land of promise, the blessings whereof we only partially possess. This is doubtless a punishment for our sins, as theirs were scourged by the stubborn lingering of what was inimical to their rest. Yet no little benefit actually accrues to us from that indwelling principle of knowledge which the presence of Christ communicates to His Church. The assertion of any common faith, the education of the young in any fixed principles, the correction of individual waywardness by the public sentence of that portion of the Church with which we are in communion—from whence come all these blessings, but from the principle that through union with the Body of the Church individuals obtain the gift of knowledge! How else could there be any validity in the imposition of creeds, or how could men pretend to set forth articles whereby others should be bound in their interpretation of Scripture? These things imply a claim to be guided by that Divine Spirit whose teaching is the only source of truth. The claim may, under present circumstances, be incomplete and provisional; but there is enough of decisiveness in the judgment of the English Church[1] to warrant the assertion that it is not

[1] To enter in detail upon the question of Church authority would be to wander from the immediate subject. All which has been here attempted, is to show that the claim to authority advanced by the English Church, in her 20th Article, stands upon a Christian and not a Rationalistic basis: that it is an appeal, not to the wisdom of men, but to the Word of God. It may be observed further, that since the Church's "authority in controversies of faith" depends upon the relation between the Word engrafted and the Word imparted, its office as a "witness and keeper" does not extend to all

abandoned. If we compare the position of her children with that of the members of any dissenting sect, or even with that of the Protestants of Germany, we see the immense difference which results from her claiming to possess a fixed principle of judgment. In the Protestant bodies in all parts of the Continent, subscription to Articles is always understood to be subordinate to the principle of private interpretation: those who sign, *i.e.* profess to express their accordance, so far as what they subscribe agrees in their judgment with Scripture. The individual interpretation of each man is the fixed principle: the Body which requires subscription has no external authority. There are as many faiths, therefore, as there are subscribers. For these formularies, having been originally dictated only by individuals, can have no authority to bind the consciences of others. The words of one of the Reformers, however learned and holy, cannot be set up as a permanent barrier against the progress of truth. What one man has asserted, another may question. There can be no permanent authority except from God. Subscription, therefore, as it is required in the Church of England, implies a belief in the guiding care of that Divine Spirit, to whose decisions individual consciences are bound to defer.[1] What God has been pleased

subjects, but only to those points on which it is essential to maintain the "faith once delivered to the Saints." The existence, therefore, of opposing usages in the Church at different times and in different places, however objectionable some of them may be, or the prevalence of contradictory judgments on points which the Word imparted has not decided, do not prove her devoid of an engrafted power of spiritual judgment. And even if the rule of Church authority should be open to a measure of the same uncertainty with the general laws of human obligation (vide p. 340), it may still be a guide to the faithful on essential questions. Those who observe how much mankind is influenced by the faith which prevails around them —how large a portion of national character is owing to the habits and rules of life—how impossible it is even to introduce political institutions among a people which is not fitted to receive them—will not attach little importance to that *education* which it has pleased God to bestow upon Christendom through His Church, and to those essential principles, which His presence has preserved through the countless errors of eighteen centuries.

[1] Those Lutheran Divines who maintain the authority of confessions of faith, argues Kant, say to us, "Draw your conclusions from the source itself, the Bible, whence you may derive it pure and uncontaminated; but

to teach is received because He has taught it. Without His guidance there can be no permanent creed, and no plenary subscription. The measure therefore of accordance which exists in the English Church is a perfect recognition of that Divine power without which there could be neither holiness nor concord. Every Minister who declares his "unfeigned assent and consent" to the Book of Common Prayer is in fact ratifying the spiritual authority which prescribes it. He is asserting that God is wiser than man, and that through His teaching, as conveyed through the Body of His Church, an *assurance* is bestowed upon us which could not be attained through so weak and uncertain an instrument as human reason. He is affirming the principle of Christianity as opposed to that of Rationalism.

Thus then does a rule exist among us, which, though it might be more complete, is yet far from being illusory. We can discern the track, when looked at as a whole, and see that it really serves as a guide amidst most of our perplexities; though, like travellers tracing the vestiges of an unfrequented path, we can scarcely detect each successive portion as it is occupied by our footsteps. And it belongs to the very nature of moral rules to be subject to this uncertainty. Where the contest is between private caprice and the public sentence of the Christian Body, the decision must be the same as when any single portion of the Church opposes the collective testimony of the Christian community. Thus is a criterion provided, which it is the duty of individuals to accept and apply. And most of all it is thus that we have the inestimable benefit of those three Creeds for which the wisdom of God made provision before the East and West were finally disunited. To His Providence we doubtless owe it,

take care that you do not discover anything in the Bible except what *we* find there." "My good friends," is his reply, "you had better tell us what you find in the Bible, that we may not search in vain, and be told by you at last, that what we fancied that we had found there is our own misinterpretation." His conclusion, therefore, is that no external standard of dogmatic truth can be maintained in a Church which does not claim authority in the interpretation of Scripture.—*Kant's Streit der Facultaten.*

that these fundamental questions were decided before sin had destroyed the blessing of unity. If such blessings are to be extended, it must be through the arrival of that more perfect condition of the Church, of which unity is as plain a characteristic as holiness. For its Great Head, in His dying prayer, included the one of them as distinctly as the other. Both, therefore, should find equal place in the petitions of Christians. When Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim, may these things be. For knowledge and holiness, coming to us through Christ Our Lord, are attributes of His Body Mystical by grace, as to His Sacred Person they pertain by nature. Now division in this Body is sin; and sin being the privation of the one of these is fatal to the other. And their blending and commingling nature is evidenced by their perfect union in Him, in whom alone either dwells completely. For knowledge is not perfect, save in Him whose nature is love. And if in man it is to be completely manifest, it can only be through the acquisition of that state of which man's first dwelling-place was an anticipation, when the Tree of Knowledge stands by the Tree of Life in the midst of the Paradise of God.

CHAPTER XV.

CONCLUSION.

The Doctrine of Our Lord's Incarnation has been considered, and how it rendered Him the representative of that inferior race, whose nature in wondrous mercy He vouchsafed to partake.[1] Again, His method of union with the individual members of the new family, which He redeemed from the ruins of the Fall, has been shown to depend on that Mediatorial character which belonged to His compound nature;[2] and the outline of its effects upon humanity at large has been slightly traced.[3] The characteristic

[1] Cap. 1–6. [2] Cap. 7–13. [3] Cap. 14.

distinction between Rationalism and Christianity has also been touched upon. The first has been shown to rest the connexion between God and man on that natural relation of mind to mind which was the law of Creation ; and to estimate Christ, therefore, merely as an individual, in whom the inherent powers of manhood attained that perfect development of which they were always capable. But Christianity starts with the supposition that in Christ the forfeited privileges of our race were given back, through the supernatural presence of Godhead. Hence arises that law of Mediation, which implies that all the blessings which the higher Being bestows upon the lower were centred in the Humanity of the Incarnate Son, that so from His manhood they might be communicated to the successive generations of His brethren. Thus to that old Creation, the ends whereof were frustrated by man's Fall, is opposed the regeneration of his race through its new Creation in the second Adam.

It remains, in conclusion, to make some brief inquiry, whether due importance is ascribed to this great event ; whether the habits and opinions of our age imply a consciousness where and how our common nature was truly ennobled ; whether humanity at large has been adequately impressed by that most momentous of all its vicissitudes —" the taking of the manhood into God."

In the earlier ages of the Church's History, the manhood of Our Lord was often questioned by those whose object was to reduce religion to an abstract philosophy, and who, therefore, rejected whatever brought it into actual contact with the life of men. The same evil seems in the present day to be attained in a different order : those who are impatient of that large influence which the manhood of Christ must needs exercise upon the life of men, call in the aid of a philosophical religion to justify their practical unbelief. A few instances of this tendency shall be noticed.

1. The doctrine of a future judgment is rested in Holy Writ upon the Incarnation of the Eternal Son. God "hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that *Man* whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance

unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." Now surely this great truth is not sufficiently remembered in the present day. It is not only forgotten in the market-place, but it is not adequately enforced in the pulpit. This may in part arise, because ordinary pastoral instruction in the Church of England is not backed by any systematic agency for the conversion of the careless. The calm and orderly course which is required for the one is wholly different from the occasional and stimulating measures which are needed for the other. Such a view of judgment-to-come as might bring it practically before the minds of men, would need to be accompanied by other steps, which can hardly be taken so long as the jealousy of the civil power deprives the Church of those opportunities of common deliberation, without which it is impossible for her to adopt such measures as are required by the exigency of the times. This may contribute to a result which is more easy to account for than to justify. The tendency is greatly increased by that loose view of human responsibility, which supposes that repentance not only avails for the obtaining of pardon, but that it renders all past actions indifferent. This notion may be grateful to careless men, but it derives no countenance either from revelation or philosophy. The last should remind men that their final character is the result of all the previous impulses by which they have been actuated, and that however hidden from themselves, it is plainly conceivable that the whole mysterious thread of their complicated existence may be traced by an Omniscient Judge through all its tangled multiplicity. And the same infallible Scriptures which declare salvation to the penitent, through the blood of the Incarnate Mediator, declare that God "hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man." Except for His gracious intervention in the world of created beings, our race had perished in its birth; it had been incapable of trial and glory. The Incarnation of the Son of God involves examination, and makes acquittal possible. But then it teaches the certainty of the trial. The very office of a judge is to examine into actions; and to assign this function to one who is

characterized by participation in our material nature, if it shows the leniency with which we may hope that judgment will be exercised, shows also its reality and literal truth. The forgetfulness then of an actual, certain, individual judgment—the attempt to explain it away into a mere act of reflex thought—shows a forgetfulness of our place in that delegated Kingdom of the Son of Man whereby "all power in heaven and earth" has been assigned to Him. The different feeling of the Apostles led to their continual reference to *that day*[1] when "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."[2]

2. The distribution of the Christian year has the same reference to the renewal of our race through the Incarnation of the Son of God, which the Jewish seasons had to the Creation. As it was the purpose of the old Covenant to vindicate God's creative power, as a preparation for *His* coming, through whom creation should re-enter upon its forfeited inheritance, so the new Covenant is built upon the new creation of humanity in Christ Our Lord. Now every division of time under the Mosaic law testified to its purpose. The weekly observance of the Sabbath Day was a perpetual testimony to the Creator. The Feast of Tabernacles attested the yearly bounty of His Providence. The Passover and Feast of Weeks showed how He had taken a single family out of the idolatrous world to obey His law and be the depository of His promises. The whole Christian year is built in like manner upon the Mediation of Christ. Its weekly day of solemn worship is the memorial of the Redeemer's triumphant rest after the more stupendous labours of His new Creation. In like manner its three yearly seasons, Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, tell of His Birth, Sacrifice, and Spiritual Legislation. If we follow the matter more into detail, we find the anniversary of Our Lord's Birth preceded by that Feast of the Annunciation which witnesses when He became Incarnate in the flesh. It is followed by His Circumcision, and Announcement to the Gentiles. Then come the Forty Days of Humiliation, which precede His Sufferings and Triumph. The

[1] 2 Tim. i. 12, 18; 2 Thess. i. 10. [2] Rom. xiv. 10.

last portion of them is characterized by reference to His daily recorded actions, as the Representative and Redeemer of our race. They conclude with that Feast of Easter which forms the birth-day of the new Creation. Afterwards are there Forty Days of Rejoicing, while we approach the hour when, ascending up into heaven, He "received gifts for men," which, on the approaching Festival of Pentecost, He bestowed upon them. And the whole series is closed with the recollection of that ultimate mystery of the Blessed Trinity in Unity, to which our Lord's Incarnation leads up the wondering mind—a mystery which is at once the beginning of all being and the end of all thought. Now, can the prevalent neglect of such a system as this be compatible with any practical belief in that real Manhood of Christ Our Lord, which binds Him at this moment to collective humanity? Surely there are not wanting affections in man's nature; and his habits witness to the cherished feelings of the heart. Were men duly sensible of their nearness to Christ, their Master—did they feel the reality of that man's nature, whereby He binds Himself to all His brethren—these public birthdays of our race could not be passed by with an indifference which is not betrayed in the case of national solemnities, or respecting the æras of our private life.

It would be of little purpose to point to those national changes which have been ordained by Parliament, because the Legislature has for some years been selected on a principle of indifference to religion, which it is safer and more honest that it should openly avow. Otherwise those recent changes might be instanced, which require the opening of Courts of Justice at that solemn season of our own deliverance, when the universal feeling of the Christian world had pronounced it unseemly to be passing judgment on our erring brethren. That our Quarter Sessions should be held in the week before Easter, is the renunciation of a public homage to our Lord's Humanity, which commenced so soon as Christianity became the faith of the empire. But it is more to the purpose to ask why the arrangements of the Christian year are so little regarded by those who profess reverence for the

Christian Faith? Can it be felt how truly humanity at large has been exalted in Him? Is the place of His man's nature in the work of Mediation and Intercession duly estimated? Do men perceive that a real belief in their union with Him would give them a personal interest in every incident which tells upon His earthly life? Whereas, to say nothing of the prevalent neglect of these seasons by well-intentioned persons—of the closed doors of our Churches—of the banquets by which Christians can celebrate the mourning of Christ—marrying and giving in marriage—besides these instances in which the love of pleasure preponderates over associations which cannot but be admitted, the neglect of the great act and principle of our new Creation shows itself in that singular error which degrades the weekly anniversary of Christ's Resurrection into a mere Jewish observance. It is not, of course, disputed that the Lord's Day is founded upon that weekly division of time which commemorates the original Creation. But to call it the Sabbath without adding that condition of its being the *Christian* Sabbath, which raises it from the old to the new Creation, to rest it merely upon the Fourth Commandment, is to derogate from its Christian character, and to destroy its weekly testimony to the renewal of man's nature in its regeneration through Christ. The effect of such a Judaical error is that the spiritual nature of this great feast is obscured, and with it the reality of that momentous change, whereby the whole family of mankind was reconstructed.

3. Such circumstances are, of course, intimately connected with that prevalent neglect with which those all-important ordinances which bind us to the Body of Christ, and that collective union which is bestowed upon us in Him, have come to be treated. How can the Church's rule, that the daily service of intercession should be offered by all her priests, be reconciled with the closed doors of our sanctuaries and their silent altars? Is it practically believed that the perpetual sacrifice of our great High Priest has its operation through the Ministry of His earthly Servants? What can be expected also, so long as there continue

to be numerous parishes in our land where the opportunity of fellowship with Christ through the Holy Communion is only offered quarterly to the people? What life can be anticipated in the Christian society—what doctrinal perception of the nature of its being—while this enforced obedience to the letter of our Canon shows that the quickening principle of the Church's vitality is so little appreciated? What a departure this from that early precedent, when the Disciples at Troas came together weekly to break bread!

Now, how can such a defalcation be justified? The offering of Our Redeemer's sacrifice is not impaired by time. The reality of His Intercession is not suspended. But a chilling apathy has withdrawn attention from that principle of life in Him, which should quicken all His members. This may be traced partly to those interferences of the temporal power which have obscured men's perception of the nature and origin of spiritual jurisdiction. The Church's power has been grasped at and used by the State for worldly purposes, till the very name of Church authority stinks in men's nostrils. To this we must attribute the strange jealousy expressed in the late trivial disputes on rubrical matters because a few Clergymen professed themselves bound in conscience to act according to their promises. But surely everything indicates that the time is coming when that living spirit which animates the Body of Christ cannot any longer be dispensed with. The strange aspect of falling monarchies, the increasing commotions of daily life, show how perishable are the forms of natural society. They testify then to the importance of those binding principles by which, out of the mouldering ruins of the Roman Empire, was originally reared the fabric of European civilization. When everything established is crumbling away, the elements of order cannot re-adjust themselves, save by reference to the internal laws of their being. Yet where shall there be found a principle which may rest not on force but on love, and yet be strong enough to bridle the violence of individual appetite? It must be so comprehensive that it may

teach the great the extent of their responsibilities, and yet reveal to the humble the real dignity of their state. It must preach humility in the palace and self-respect in the lowly hovels of the poor. In the first it must enforce such lessons of self-denial as may mitigate the glare of earthly splendour, while it compensates the afflicted for the necessary privations of their lot. It must demonstrate to philosophy the existence of a law above its reach, yet be a guide to the unlettered along the busy paths of practical life. All this must come from some simple, single, irresistible influence, such as may give peace amidst the collisions, and oneness amidst the distractions of the public mind. Yet where in nature may we look for such a remedy? We can find it only in that power whereby nature is elevated above itself. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me." None save man's Creator can guide him amidst the uncertainties of his present state. "They will not be learned nor understand: all the foundations of the earth are out of course." To Him, then, the Pattern and Representative of our being, the New Man, the second Adam of redeemed mortality, we bring those wants and difficulties which we have inherited from the first. Amidst earth's distractions we seek peace: we ask guidance amidst the perplexities of earthly reason. So long as we are one with Thee we are at rest. Though neither sun nor stars have for many days appeared, and no small tempest lies upon us, yet we have assurance that Thy presence is in our bark.

NOTE TO CHAPTER X.

There are three sets of terms, which in ordinary language appear to be used as though nearly of equivalent force: material and immaterial—substantial and unsubstantial—bodily and spiritual. But by theological writers these terms are not usually employed as equivalent. When it is said that "the Son is of one *substance* (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father," substance is supposed to be immaterial. Again, that which is material could not be spoken of as immaterial also, but we read "there is a *spiritual body*." If we would avoid misconception, therefore, we must define in what sense we use terms, and we must abide by the signification which is assigned to them.

Now, a different meaning will usually be assigned to these words by those who adopt the Baconian, and by those who adopt the Aristotelian habit of thought. For while Lord Bacon made experiment the source of all knowledge, Aristotle's view of the world was drawn in great measure out of the ideas respecting it, which are inherent in man's nature. Both systems have their use: it is true, as Lord Bacon says, that the sensible properties of things are only to be known by such experiments as enable us to scrutinize and compare them; and yet those laws of thought, which the Creator has rendered essential to the exercise of our inner nature, are as much to be trusted as any other medium of knowledge with which He has supplied us. But when anything is proposed for our consideration, the Baconian will turn his attention to its physical parts, to the materials of which it is composed; while the Aristotelian will resolve the complicated idea, which it excites in the mind, into those simple ideas which are implied in it. Let the object proposed for consideration be man. The Baconian will observe that he consists of body and soul: the one consisting of matter, which the senses can discern; the other of spirit, which is discerned only by consciousness. Again, his body may be divided into its separate limbs, distinguished by their shape, size, colour, solidity, or any other circumstance which the senses of the anatomist can detect. The Baconian will not profess to know more about it than can be gained from the observation of its sensible qualities; for he will speak of that which is *material* in man as equivalent with that which the senses can discern; or he will define matter to be that of which our senses are fitted to take cognizance. He will admit that some material bodies are so subtile, that they may in fact elude our observation; but even if he supposed with Lucretius that the soul was material, he would in that case imagine that it acted upon the body through material particles of the finest construction:—

> "——his igitur quædam natura necesse est
> Attribuatur (ea est omnino nominis expers):
> Qua neque mobilius quicquam, neque tenuius extat,
> Nec magis e parvis aut lævibus ex elementis;
> Sensiferos motus, quæ didit prima per artus."—iii. 2, 42.

The Baconian, however, would not be likely to consider the soul material.

On the contrary, he would refer it to a different order of being, to the existence whereof his own consciousness testifies, and which he feels to be exempted from those laws by which material bodies are governed.

The Aristotelian will approach this whole subject in a different manner. In the first place he will consider to what class *man* should be referred. Again, as respects man's body, he will discriminate between those ideas which such a thing as the body necessarily implies, and those which are only accidentally connected with it. Thus he will refer the body to the class of substances, while he will discriminate it from other substances by those accidents which belong to it, and do not belong to them. Thus does Damascene tell us: "corpus substantia est, color vero accidentalis" (vol. i. p. 10). So that the meaning attached to the word *matter*, and that attached to *substance*, are arrived at in wholly different ways; the ideas have no relation to one another; by matter is meant that of which the senses take note: by substance an abstract notion which the intellect obtains by disregarding those accidents by which one individual of a class is distinguished from others.

Now it is true that the word *matter* might be used, and is used by Aristotelians, who will of course employ it, as they do other terms, in an abstract sense; but as this is not the most common, so it does not appear to be the most appropriate use of the expression. For the word *substance*, with those which are related to it, is pre-eminently a metaphysical term, and was introduced by the Greek philosophers with a view of expressing the notion, that while different things were discriminated by accidental peculiarities, they must yet possess some common basis, on which their distinctions might be supposed to be built. This common basis, therefore, was called *τὸ ὑποκειμενον*, or *ὑπόστασις*, and hence were formed the words *suppositum* and *substantia*. Now, the terms which are employed for spirit, body, matter, &c., have not this decidedly metaphysical origin, even though we may be unable to trace the visible analogies from which they are derived. In the case of *spirit*, indeed, different nations seem to have discerned an analogy between the action of man's inward principle, and that volatile and subtile agent, the wind, which produces motion while itself unseen, and is the author of sudden and unaccountable impulses. And no doubt the relation between breath and life draws attention to the justness of the analogy. Thus נְשָׁמָה is derived from an unused verb, which means to breathe. רוּחַ wind, and also breath. *πνεῦμα* from *πνέω*. *ψυχή* from *ψύχω*, to breathe or shiver. *Animus* from *ἄνεμος*, wind. Hence Gothice *Alma*. *Spiritus* from *spiro*. *Geist* from *geisten*, to blow, whence our "gust." The derivation of "materies" from "mater," which is given by Facciolati, is less certain, but the parallel word, both in Greek and German, is plainly derived from the idea that a utensil is formed out of a block of wood by shaping it. Hence *ὕλη* is the *matter* of anything. The same is the origin of the German *Stoff*. *Stofn* in Anglo-Saxon is the trunk of a tree. *Stæf* a staff. Hence "*buchstab*" a letter. Hesychius gives *στύπη, truncus*. These derivations are physical, not metaphysical. Their history is the reverse of that of such words as *substantia*, or again of *essentia*, *οὐσία*, *being*, *wesen*, terms which are derived by abstraction from the infinitive of the verb *to be*.

These considerations supply a reason for adopting that which seems to be the common custom in our language, that when the word "material"

is opposed to the word "spiritual," it should not be used as a metaphysical term, but should be taken to imply merely that the things spoken of are objects, of which man's senses are fitted to take cognizance. This of course is a wholly different meaning from that which the word *matter* would bear when used by Aristotelians; by whom it would be designed to be, as Aquinas explains it, the "principium individuationis," by which common forms are individualized.—*Summa Theol.* i. Q. 3, 2. It has been stated therefore (p. 186), that in this Chapter the words *material* or *bodily* are employed to express things, which are of such a nature as to be taken note of by the senses. And with a view of avoiding those mistakes which are produced when words are understood in a different sense from that in which they are employed, the use of the term *substance* and *substantial*, however appropriate in itself, has commonly been abstained from.

It has been objected, however, by a reviewer, that to speak of Our Lord's glorified body as material is an unusual mode of expression; that it implies Our Lord's body to be corruptible, or at least liable to change, and is incompatible, therefore, with the truth that His body is a glorified body.—*Ecclesiastic*, No. 47, Nov. 1849, p. 307. But if the term material be supposed to mean cognizable by the senses, there is no reason why it should involve the corruptible nature of the things to which it is applied. The ultimate portions of matter may very possibly be imperishable. And though the ancient writers do not speak of Our Lord's glorified body as ὑλικόν or materiale (for such phrases were unusual with them), yet they attribute to it the thing which is expressed by the term material, *i.e.*, that it is fitted to be taken cognizance of by men's senses. They speak of four different modifications under which the body may exist:—

First—As it did in Adam before the Fall. Subject to want, because sustained by food, but not to pain or concupiscence. This is called ψυχικὸν σῶμα, 1 Cor. xv. 46: "animale corpus."—*De Civitate Dei* xii. 20.

Secondly—As in Adam after the Fall. Subject to pain and concupiscence, as well as want.

Thirdly—As Christ's body did before His resurrection. Subject to pain and want, but not to concupiscence.

Fourthly—As the glorified body, at present possessed by Christ, and hereafter to be possessed by His servants. σῶμα πνευματικόν. Not subject either to pain, want, or concupiscence.

Now, that they supposed this last kind of body to be material, in the sense in which that term is used in this Chapter, is evident both from the particulars in which it is spoken of as though it were purely a spirit, and from the particulars in which it is supposed to differ from a spirit. It is like a spirit, first, in being free from suffering and corruption. "ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἀκήρατον." — *Theophylact on* 2 Cor. v. 16. "ἀθάνατον καὶ ἄφθαρτον."—*Theodoret in Suicer, on* 'Ανάστασις. Secondly, in being more subtile than other bodies. λεπτόν.—*Damasc. de Fid. Orth.* iv. 28. "λεπτομερέστερον καὶ κοῦφον, οἷον ἐπ' ἀέρος ὀχεῖσθαι." –*Theophylact on* 1 Cor. xv. 44. Thirdly, in being under the peculiar influence of the ennobling Spirit by which it is possessed. "ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ φύσει πνεύματος."—*Athan. contra Apollinarium*, i. 8, vol. ii. p. 928. It is this last circumstance which prevents it from being an object to the senses of

men, except when Our Lord Himself so pleases. He is not merely withdrawn from our sight by the distance to which he is removed, but by the circumstance that a glorified body, though in its nature a suitable object for men's senses, yet is not in fact obvious to them, except when they are rendered capable by Divine power to discern it. Such a quality will belong, according to St. Thomas, to the glorified bodies of the Saints: "Secundum naturam palpabile est corpus glorificum: sed ex virtute supernaturali hoc ei competit, ut eum valeat palpetur a corpore non glorioso: et ideo Gregorius dicit, quod Dominus palpandam carnem præbuit, quam clausis januis introduxit, ut probaret ostenderet, post resurrectionem corpus suum esse et ejusdem naturæ et alterius gloriæ."—*Summa, Supp. ad* iii. Q. 83, 6.

To express this peculiar mode of existence, at once suitable to be beheld by the senses, and yet not commonly obvious to them, the Fathers speak of Our Lord's body as, "οὐκ ἔτι μὲν σάρκα, οὐκ ἀπάθητον δέ."—*Greg. Naz.* Or. xv. p. 671. But more commonly they say, as St. Ignatius does, "μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα."—*Ad Smyrnæos.* And Theophylact says (on 2 Cor. v. 16), that when Our Lord was upon earth, He may be said to have lived according to the flesh; because He was subject to its wants, though not to its sins. But now, though He has ascended in the flesh, He is not subject to either. And in proof that our Lord's body is not simply a spirit, they refer constantly to the fact that it is an object to men's senses, considering His own words (St. Luke xxiv. 39) a sufficient proof that this cannot properly be said to be the case with a spirit.—Vide *S. Athan. ad Epict.* sec. 7, vol. ii. p. 906, and *Contra Apoll.* i. 6, p. 926. Thus the Second Council of Nice asserts Christ's body to be "ὁρατὸν καὶ περίγραπτος καὶ καταληπτός."—*Hard.* iv. 426. And S. Austin in Joan, Trac. xix. 16: "Quomodo ergo non ipse venturus est? Quia non ipse videbitur in judicio? Videbunt in quem pupugerunt. Forma illa erit judex: quæ stetit sub judice: illa judicabit, quæ judicata est: judicata est enim iniquo, judicabit juste. Veniet ergo forma servi, et ipsa apparebit. Etenim forma Dei quomodo appareret justis et injustis? Nam si judicium non fieret nisi inter solos justos, appareret tanquam justis forma Dei," &c.

Two conditions are involved in the idea that a thing should be a true object to men's senses—first, that it should be limited by outline: secondly, that it should be present in place. These accordingly are stated by Aquinas to be properties which can belong only to bodies: "Nihil potest esse terminus localis a quo, vel ad quem, nisi sit corpus."—*Summa*, i. Q. 3, 1. This is the notion expressed by Lucretius:—

> "Quæ tamen omnia *corporea* constare necesse est
> Natura; quoniam *sensus impellere* possunt:
> Tangere enim et tangi nisi corpus, nulla potest res."

Now both of these conditions are affirmed to belong to Our Lord's glorified body. Theodoret calls it "σῶμα δὲ ὅμως, τὴν οἰκείαν ἔχον περιγραφήν."—*Sulcer on* Ἀνάστασις. Vigilius says: "Quando in terra fuit caro, non erat utique in cœlo. Et nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utique in terra."—*Contra Eutych.* iv. 14. And both considerations were adduced by the Second Council of Nice, in a statement which met with no opposition: "Βλασφημίας πλῆρες τὸ ἀπερίγραφον μετὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν

διαγορεῦσαι τὸν ἐπὶ πάντα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν Θεὸν ἡμῶν." Then after mentioning what occurred before His resurrection: "καὶ ἵνα τὰ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους περὶ τούτου εὐαγγελικῶς λεχθέντα ἐάσωμεν, τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εἴποιμι. ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἐμφανίσας ἑαυτὸν, ἀπερίγραπτος ἦν οὐδαμῶς. τὸ ἑαυτὸν φανερῶσαι δυσὶ μαθηταῖς, περιγραφῆς ἐστὶν ἴδιον. τὸ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ ὑπὸ Θωμᾶ ψηλαφηθῆναι, τί ἕτερον ἢ περιγραφή; καὶ τὸ πορευθῆναι τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κἀκεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὀφθῆναι καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι, αὐτὸν τοῦτό ἐστι. τὸ δὲ βλεπόντων τῶν μαθητῶν ἀναληφθῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῖς ἐπιστάντος καὶ εἰπόντος, ἄνδρες . . . οὕτως ἐλεύσεται . . . ἆρα οὐκ ἔστι περιγραφῆς ταῦτα; καὶ πάνυγε. οὕτως γὰρ καὶ πάντες οἱ θεοφόροι πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐκδιδάσκουσι. καὶ πρόδηλόν ἐστι τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσιν, ὅτι καθὸ μὲν Θεὸς καὶ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, ἐστὶν ἀόρατος, ἀπερίγραπτος, ἀκατάληπτος; καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐστὶ τῆς δεσποτείας αὐτοῦ· καθὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν ἀνελάβετο, καὶ ὁρατὸς καὶ περιγραπτὸς, καθὼς αὐτὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς διηγόρευσε, μὴ εἶναι ἐκεῖ, καὶ καταληπτὸς, ὡς ὁ Θωμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἐπιστώσατο."—*Harduin*, iv. 426.

The preceding statements throw some light upon the inquiry, What is meant by Our Lord's sacramental presence? The questions of most real moment upon this subject would seem to be—first, whether Our Lord is truly present, as is affirmed in this work, or whether the transaction is a mere appeal to our imagination. Secondly—If Our Lord be truly present, is it under those conditions in which He is an object to the senses of men, *i.e.*, as above defined, materially, or in some other manner? The Church of England in denying Transubstantiation means apparently to deny a *material* presence, for she explains the subject by saying that there is no "Corporal Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood;" and she states as her ground for this assertion, that "the truth of Christ's natural body" requires it to be in one place; *i.e.*, that it is subject to those conditions which render it a suitable object for the senses of mortals. She means to deny, therefore, that Our Lord's natural body is in such sort present as that we should discern those things of which we partake to be flesh and blood, were not the senses of men supernaturally withholden from discerning a glorified body. How far it is correct to say that this notion is affirmed by others, it forms no part of the present work to inquire.

But to consider somewhat more particularly what is meant by the Presence of Christ. Since He is partaker of two natures, His presence may be referred either to the one or to the other. Now as He is God, Christ partakes all Divine attributes; and according to this nature He pervades all being—*essentiâ*, as the cause of its existence, *præsentiâ*, as conscious of its state, *potentiâ*, as upholding it by His power.—*Summa Theol.* i. Q. 8, 3. But this presence, as God, does not account for those scriptural statements of the presence of Our Lord's flesh and blood, which are connected with His man's nature. How is He present as man? There is first His natural presence as man, that mode of presence, namely, which results from the properties which He retains in that His body is fitted to be the object of men's senses—that it is present, namely, in place, and limited by outline. That it retains such properties has been shown to be stated in Scripture, and to be the general belief of the Church. This is all which is here meant when Christ's body is said to be *material;* and to this the English Church refers when she says that Christ's "natural body" is in heaven. But though Our Lord's Divinity could admit of no change, yet His humanity underwent

a change which was all but infinite, through that exaltation which it received by being taken into God. So that we have a second set of properties, which may be affirmed to belong to Our Lord's body; and the only caution which is necessary in speaking of them, is that nothing be admitted which is incompatible with the conditions of man's nature, or which implies the Eutychian error that the truth of His humanity is lost. But that His body is become Spiritual, that while remaining a human body it has acquired properties which are usually connected with spiritual being, is expressly affirmed in Scripture and by the Church. This is stated by St. Athanasius, even when contending that it retains its human qualities. "*αὐτῷ τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ σώματι προσιόντι μεγάλη γέγονεν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Λόγου πρὸς αὐτὸ κοινωνίας τε καὶ ἑνώσεως. ἀπὸ γὰρ θνητοῦ γέγονεν ἀθάνατον καὶ ψυχικὸν ὂν γέγονε πνευματικὸν, καὶ ἐκ γῆς γενόμενον, τὰς οὐρανίους διέβη πύλας.*"—*Ad Epictetum*, sec. ix. vol. ii. p. 908. And again, when writing against Apollinarius, ii. 16. vol. ii. p. 952: "*ἐπουράνιος ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος, οὐχὶ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐπιδεξάμενος, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ γῆς ἐπουράνιον συστησάμενος.*" And still further, "*πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν ἡ σὰρξ ἐστὶ τοῦ Κυρίου διότι ἐκ πνεύματος τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ συνελήφθη. τὸ γὰρ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμα ἐστί.*"—*De Incarn. et c. Arian.* xvi. vol. ii. p. 883. Now, what are those spiritual qualities which Our Lord's Humanity has received? The very first, to which His own words lead us, is a new mode of presence: St. Matt. xxviii. 20; St. John xiv. 18, 28, &c. What is meant by a spiritual presence? If to speak of such a thing is not a mere delusion, there must be some definite idea which is expressed by it. Now it is laid down by all writers that when spiritual presence is spoken of, it is not meant that spirit is subject to the conditions of bodily existence, *i.e.*, to be present in place and defined by outline, but only that the energy of the spiritual object which is present is in some specific place exerted and perceived. "*λέγεται Θεὸς ἐν τόπῳ εἶναι, καὶ λέγεται τόπος Θεοῦ, ἔνθα ἔκδηλος ἡ ἐνεργεια αὐτοῦ γίνεται.*"—*Damasc. de Fid. Orth.* i. 16. "Incorporalia non sunt in loco per contactum quantitatis, dimensivæ, sicut corpora, sed per contactum virtutis."—*Summa*, i. Q. 8, 2. When we speak then of the spiritual presence of Our Lord's body, we are treating of an order of things which, so far as He is concerned, is wholly irrespective of considerations of locality. So far as such considerations come in at all, it is by reason only of the earthly object with which He is present. For though spirits are not in themselves present in place, yet they may acquire local position through the nature of the objects with which they are present. The Angels must be supposed to be independent of the conditions to which bodies are subject, yet the Angel who went down to trouble the waters of Bethesda executed his office in a certain place. Whereas on the other hand, if one spiritual being is present with another, the considerations of locality are wholly excluded. Almighty God is present by grace in His saints, "sicut objectum cognitionis in cognoscente."—*Summa*, i. Q. 8, 3. And St. Chrysostom (Hom. xvi. in epist. ad Hebræos) and Theodoret (in Psalm cxiv.) speak of God as present in heaven, because His illimitable nature dwells with peculiar satisfaction in the praises of His saints: "*ἐπειδὰν τοῖς ἄνω πνεύμασιν, ὡς ἁγίοις ἐπαναπαύεται, ταύτῃ τοι φαμὲν θρόνον τε καὶ οἶκον αὐτοῦ τὸν οὐρανόν.*"—*S. Cyril Alex.* in cap. lxi. *Jesaiæ.*

Now, there are some who look upon the presence of Our Lord's body as

though it were only of this last kind; as though it were only in the minds of men, and as if the relations of place were as little to be taken account of in respect of the object in which Christ takes up His dwelling, as they are in respect to the nature whereby He dwells there. This notion requires the more attention, because it has been adopted by some who would fain retain a belief in Our Lord's Presence, without accepting the doctrine of the ancient Church in its simple truth. It was favoured by Hooker, who hoped in this way to find a standing-ground for the Sacramentaries within the limits of the Catholic Church. And it promises to get rid of two difficulties—For first, it may be pretended that all, whether good or bad, equally receive their Maker in the Holy Communion; and secondly, if Christ's presence be in the consecrated elements, it does not very clearly appear how it is again withdrawn from them; and therefore how it is exempted from the dissolution to which they are liable. In respect, however, to the first difficulty, it must be remembered that Christ's presence is not according to the natural order of things, but according to a supernatural one; it is a presence, that is, *by grace*. Now the same thing is true of God's gifts by grace, which is true in a measure even of His gifts by nature —they need for their reception those peculiar faculties which He has Himself provided. Light were useless without eyes, and that presence of Christ, which is truly bestowed in the consecrated elements is inoperative without faith on the part of the receiver. On this is built the statement that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." "De fide interioris hominis procedit divini gustus saporis, dum certe per salutaris Eucharistiæ infusionem influit Christus in viscera animæ sumentis, quem diva mens castis penetralibus in eâ videlicet formâ suscipit, quâ sub ipsa recordatione mysterii Spiritu revelante sibi præsentem intuetur, infantem, aut arâ crucis immolatum, aut sepulchro quiescentem, aut certe calcatâ morte resurgentem, sive supra cœlos evectum in gloria Patris sublimem. Juxta quas species Christus gratum communicantis intrans habitaculum, tot ut ita dicam suavitatis odoribus mentem reficit, quot formis intimæ revelationis oculum meditantis cum meruerit intueri."—*Fulberti Carnutensis*, Ep. i.; *Bib. Pat. Max.* xviii. 5. It is not that the receiver's faith makes bread become Christ's body, but that without faith, as the instrument for apprehending things unseen, men cannot receive Christ to the sanctification of their souls. Again, as respects the second difficulty, it was the notion of the ancient Church that the consecrated elements continued to be that which they had been made, even when they were reserved with a view to their participation. The Church of England has thought it expedient to order their immediate consumption; but supposing them to be kept as long as they were suitable for distribution, it would still be in this peculiar relation that they would be the depositories of Christ's presence. As to the ground on which Hooker advocated the idea of a mere presence in the receiver; the union of various parties—its recommendation has long passed away; for those who adopt the Zuinglian theory have discarded the truth of the real Presence, under any modification. And it is wholly impossible to reconcile it in any way with that uniform judgment of the early Church, with which the Church of England professes to agree. Let any one take the commentary on the sixth chapter of St. John, by that great witness to Our Lord's Incarnation, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and he will find it a continual witness against such a notion.

"Not unwisely, says Our Lord, have you denied to the flesh the power of giving life. For if the nature of flesh be looked at in itself, it is not life-giving. It will give life to nothing, but rather needs a power to give life to itself. But if you take the mystery of the Incarnation into account, and learn who it is who dwells in this flesh, you will by all means, He says, be disposed to allow, unless you speak against the Divine Spirit itself, that it is able to give life, even though the flesh by itself profit nothing. For when it is united to the life-producing Word, it becomes itself wholly life-producing, mounting up to the level of that which is better than itself, and not bringing down to itself that which cannot be debased."—*Comment. on St. John*, xi. v. 61, vol. iv. p. 376. "And if the flesh of our Saviour became life-giving, as being united to that which is naturally life, that is, to the Word of God; then we too, when we shall taste it, have the life in ourselves by being one with it, even as it is one with the indwelling Word. For on this account, even when He raised the dead, the Saviour is observed not to have acted only by word, or divine commands, but He took especial care to employ the co-operation of His sacred flesh, that He might show it to be able to give life, and to be truly rendered one with Himself. . . . . And if by the mere touch of His sacred flesh, that which is dead is made to live, how can it fail to be a yet richer gain, which we shall receive in the life giving Eucharist (εὐλογίας), when we shall even taste it."—*Id.* v. 54, p. 361.

These are only specimens of a mode of speaking, which runs through all the ancient Fathers, and which it is impossible to neglect, unless we are to abandon their doctrine, that man's renewal is bestowed by the Holy Ghost through participation in the sanctified manhood of the Incarnate Mediator, and not through the efficiency of our individual exertions. Neither will anything else accord with the words of Scripture, or of our own Church. For "the *cup of blessing* which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Or how else can it be said, that "Christ's Body is *given*, *taken*, and *eaten* in the Supper"? And no other supposition consists with the perfect maintenance of those two natures, human and divine, whereby the Incarnate Mediator continues to act. For if Christ's presence be in any sense *real*, to suppose that it has its actual dwelling exclusively in the minds of men, is to refer it to a mode of existence which belongs pre-eminently to Deity; and thus to leave the actions of Our Lord's manhood out of sight. As it has been objected, therefore, to the *carnal* notion of Our Lord's presence, that it is to ascribe the attributes of Deity to His man's nature, so would this supposition be such an omission of the conditions which characterize His Humanity, as would lead, not less surely, to the system of Eutychianism.

In respect, then, to the two points which have been especial subjects of discussion, it may be said, first, that the presence of Our Lord's Body and Blood is not a material presence, that so far as Christ's body is a fitting object for the senses, or a natural body, it is in heaven. This is understood to be the truth asserted by the Church of England, when she denies the doctrine of Transubstantiation: she is using the term substantial as equivalent to material or natural, and not referring to any metaphysical sense, which may be given to it. But, secondly, Our Lord's Body and Blood, though not materially, are yet truly and really present

in the consecrated elements. They are not present in place or by outline, as though His body were a *mere* body, but by reason of those spiritual properties which render His flesh ζωοποιός, as St. Cyril expresses it, and which belong to it because it is σῶμα πνευματικόν. So that without adoring the elements or recognizing any corporal presence of Christ, men may fully concur in the words of Bishop Andrews: "Nos vero, et in mysteriis Carnem Christi adoramus, cum Ambrosio: et non id sed Eum, qui super altare colitur. Nec Carnem manducamus, quin adoramus prius cum Augustino. . . . Et Sacramentum tamen nulli adoramus."—*Responsio ad Apol. Bellarm.* p. 195.

INDEX.

Adam's natural perfection, 204.
Anselm's, St., theory respecting Atonement, 164, and the non-salvability of Angels, 165.
Aphthartodocetæ, 94.
Apostolical succession, the safest course, 268; traced by Tertullian to St. John, 268; connexion with Our Lord's Mediation, 270; foundation of Christian education, 304.
Athanasius, St., 41, 106, 197.
Atonement, God's appointment, 160.

Baptism the foundation of Christian education, 304; its validity depends on the life of the Church, 322; its essential condition, 287; its object, 294; why its blessings disbelieved, 297; such disbelief leads to Pelagianism, 303.
Baptismal service, hypothetical, interpretation of inadmissible, 300.
Beryllus, 104.
Body, what it is, 186.
Bull, Bishop, 42.
Bunsen's Church of the Future, 264.

Chalcedon, Council of, 141.
Christ's Temptation, 54; He did not suffer sickness, 60; His Body the medium of healing virtue, 63; His character gradually understood, 103, 126; not really ignorant, 69; His sympathy, how limited, 75; His universality of mind, 76; His Body created, 116; but not worshipped as a creature, 114, 209; title of Son not derived from His Advent, 117; naturally the image of God, 118; real union of His two natures, 124; His Personality in His Godhead, 133.
Christ's manhood, how affected by hypostatic union, 131, 134, 137, 145; the channel of grace to men, 135, 193, 199, 219, 283, 308, 320, and the channel of knowledge, 324; the material of His sacrifice, 156; the stone cut out without hands, 216; the vine, 203; anointed in Incarnation, 136, 155.
Christ's ascension an epoch in His history, 149; His teaching, 150; example, 151; sacrifice, 153; a priest, 156; a victim, 158; the only real

priest under both covenants, 261; His Atonement, 160; His mediation a real work, 38, 168, 208; its meaning, 145; the medium of intercourse between man and God, 222; His worship the germinant principle of Christian faith, 88; His acts the foundation of the Creed, 146; His miracles the natural result of His constitution, 208.
Christ, the second Adam, 7; the new type of mankind, 40, 163, 199, 201, 204, 341.
Christ of one substance with the Father, 102; His eternal generation, 102; why called the *Word*, 329; His natural Body in Heaven, 188; four states under which His Body existed, 373; oneness of His Body leads to Church's unity, 216.
Christ's presence the presence of both His natures, 180, a real presence, 375, brought about through the Holy Ghost, 193, 286; an objective presence, not dependent on our thoughts, 191; consequent on His Ascension, 189; His intervention through angels before His Incarnation, 184; His holiness imparted or infused, 321.
Christian Year, its seasons not appreciated, 367; meaning of its festivals, 366.
Church began with Abraham, 14; the true Israel, 15; its teaching office in production of Creeds, 80; its guidance necessary to the understanding of Scripture, 331, 343, and its authority to that of inspiration, 345, 350, 359; its authority in controversies of faith twofold, 84; does not rest upon logical argument, though accordant with it, 347, 348; but derived from divine promise, 359; and the belief that God is wiser than man, 362; as shown by subscription required by the Church of England, 359, 360; regarded by Whately, not as a means of grace, but a scheme of government, 235; called Christ's Body from its relation to His Body natural, 213; to be united to it and to Christ identical, 213, 232; thus viewed it cannot obscure Christ, 237; typified by Holy Place in Temple, 176; in what sense its ritual national, 177; the especial object of Our Lord's intercession, 203; obedience to it rests on affection, 238; why called holy, 321; no restriction to the gifts of God's grace, 352; partially a guide even to those who are not its members, 353; Church authority to be preferred to private caprice, 362.
Civil Society not the principle of man's renewal, 314.
Confirmation, its real character, 225, 286.
Conscience, 48; its limitation, 338.
Corruption of nature, 43, 44.
Council of Orange, 45.
Creatianism, 29.
Creeds, importance of, 86; rest on the authority of the Church, 347; cannot be really maintained, unless the Church's authority is admitted, 364.
Cyprian's, St., account of the effect of baptism, 299.
Cyril's, St., Anathemas, 129, 138.

Daily Service, its importance, 273.
Doctrine, its gradual growth, 142.
Dorner on the Person of Christ, 84.

Ebionites, 88.
Eucharist, St. Irenæus's view of it, 95, the Christian sacrifice, 249, ground of its sacrificial efficacy, 253; a real work, 255; the elements said to be only a sign of a sign, 284; difference between it and baptism, 287, 289; its object, according to Hooker, 305; referred to in St. John vi., 307; why not solemnised till after the Holy Ghost was given, 309.
Eutychians, effect of their error, 139.

Faith, its nature, 4; regarded as a foundation of knowledge, 337.
Fox, George, 228.

Gnostics, 89.
God, not mere Infinity, 92, 118.
Gospel of St. John, its characteristic, 307; its sixth Chapter refers to the Holy Eucharist, 307; the Gospel of which St. Paul speaks, unwritten, 325.
Glorified body not an object to senses, 373.

Hampden, Bishop, 64.
Holy Ghost, the soul of the Church, 196; He co-operates in the work of Mediation, 196; His office to join members to Our Lord's Body, 194, 197; to suppose His office to supersede that of the Son leads to Sabellianism, 196.
Holy Place, type of Church on earth, 176.

Idolatry, its evil, 56; considered in reference to second commandment, 221.
Image of God, 45.
Incarnation, great objective fact of Christianity, 3, 212; guard against Rationalism, 224; brought about both by Son and Holy Ghost, 196, connected with Trinity, 107; restored the image of God, 296.
Inspiration, 82; theories respecting it, 346; why now suggested by the Church, 351.
Intercession of Christ a part of His Mediation, 168.
Irenæus, St., 90.

Jews, no promise of their national restoration, 15, 316; their national ritual, 243; their nation substituted for a personal Saviour, 263, 316.
Joachim, Abbot, 110.
John, St., vi., refers to Holy Eucharist, 306.
Judgment to come not appreciated, 364.
Justification through imparted righteousness, 321.
Justin Martyr, 89.

Kant, 334, 362.
Knowledge comes from God, 323; either infused or engrafted, 32.

Laity partake in the Christian sacrifice, 257, 258.
Locke, 334.
Lord's Day, substituted for Jewish Sabbath, 368.

Man, why called the creature, 274.
Mankind, its collective judgment referable to community of nature, 338.
Matter, how its existence known, 187; how defined in Baconian philosophy, 371; how defined by Aristotelians, 372, 373.
Mediation of Christ, its meaning, 145; and permanence, 147; depends on His relation to mankind, 164; a real work, 168; requires a belief in Blessed Trinity, 174; supposed by some an impediment in our approach to Christ, 221.
Methodius, St., 54.
Möhler, 51.
Monarchia, tendency of the doctrine, 99.
Monothelites, 141.

Nature, human, what, 26, 200; how taken by Christ, 37; the Incarnation its greatest honour, 142; effect on it of union with Godhead, 137.
Nominalism, abuse of, 30, 127, 201.
Nestorius's errors, 127.

Personality, what, 42, 108, 132.
Prayer, why addressed particularly to the Father, 177.
Priest, its meaning, 156; belongs to Christian as much as Jewish covenant, 258; Christ a priest by virtue of His nature, 157, 261.
Private judgment a duty, not a right, 333.
Public worship rests on nature of case, rather than positive command, 241; forbidden to Christians by Roman Law, 242; depends on Mediation of Christ, 247.

Quakers, used expressions which denied Christ's existence, 224, 230; their principles led to Rationalism or Sabellianism, 229, 230, and superseded the Scriptures, 355–357.

Rationalism, how opposed to Christianity, 9; leads to Pantheism, 10; its principle, 219; flows from a denial of Christ's Mediation, 237, 310, 315; why opposed to the Old Testament, 263.
Reason, limits to its authority, 332, 342.
Religion needs objective realities, 4, 24.
Responses, essential to the maintenance of common worship, 271; opposed by the Puritans, 272.
Revelation of St. John exhibits Christian Ritual, 174.
Righteousness, infused and imparted, 321; original, a supernatural gift, 44.

Sabellian heresy, present tendency to it, 112, 196, 209, 130.
Sacraments, the means of union with the manhood of Christ, 278, 310; Our Lord's presence in them depends on His human nature, 293; the outwork of the Incarnation, 283, and its extension, 275, rendered needful by our material nature, 282; a remedy against doubtfulness, 276; moral not physical agents, 287.
Sacrifice, its different kinds, 154.
Schleiermacher, 232.

Scripture's authority, 86; the final revelation, 327; the living word, which dwells in the Church, its interpreter, 329, 343.
Spirit and Body, how distinguished, 186.
Spirit, origin of word, 372.
Subscription among Protestants neutralized by private judgment, 361.
Substance, a metaphysical term, 372.

Tertullian, 102.
Traducianism, 30.
Transubstantiation, 96.
Trinity, 83; a mystery, 107; the foundation of all being, 123; essentially connected with the incarnation of Christ, 112, 116, 140, 210, 284; why the Second Person Our Saviour, 117; coinherence of Persons, 119.

Unity of Church, its principle, 215; its origin in the unity of the Divine nature, 218, a necessary condition of the Church's existence, 363.

Valentinian heretics, 227.
Veil of Temple, why omitted in Revelation and Epistle to Hebrews, 175.
Virgin Mary, 53; the Mother of God, 59.

Whately, Archbishop, 113, 233, 234, 284.
Worship, common, maintains our connexion with Christ, 240.

THE END.

14,240

283-232.8
W34

Wilberforce, Archdeacon
AUTHOR
The Doctrine of the Incarnation of
TITLE Our Lord Jesus Christ.

DATE

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY CA 94709

IDEAL
BOOKSTORE
1125 Amsterdam Ave.
Opp. Columbia Univ.
New York 25, N. Y.